

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 8725. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 8726. A bill for the relief of Pearl Welch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 8727. A bill for the relief of Arthur S. Chapin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8728. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6714. By Mr. COLLINS: Concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a Regular Army or military post, fort, or camp in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6715. Also, concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of Mississippi, memorializing Congress to appropriate \$250,000 for the General Samuel Dale National Shrine; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6716. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Northeastern University, Boston, Mass., favoring continuance of Civil Aeronautics Authority civilian pilot training program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6717. By Mr. HARRINGTON: Petition of Sam Cohen, John Haaga, and others, of Sioux City, Iowa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6718. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Julian Montgomery, State highway engineer of Texas, opposing House bill 6395; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6719. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., urging support of House bill 8260, providing Federal aid for engineering experiment stations in the land-grant colleges and universities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6720. Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, Washington, D. C., urging that Senate bill 685 and House bill 7971 be referred back to committee for further study; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6721. Also, petition of the Department of Health of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., urging support of Senate bill 685, as revised and amended, to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6722. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Lincoln Women's Republican Club, of St. Albans, Long Island, N. Y., favoring sugar legislation that will protect the jobs of the Brooklyn sugar-refinery workers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6723. Also, petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Brooklyn, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring sugar legislation that will protect the jobs of the Brooklyn sugar-refinery workers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6724. Also, petition of the American Water Works Association, New York City, concerning the Barkley stream-pollution bill (S. 685); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6725. By Mr. MONKIEWICZ: Petition of 301 citizens of Hartford and New Britain, Conn., and vicinity, protesting against the imposition of new processing taxes on bread and other necessities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6726. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, Local No. 2, Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y., urging support of House bill 4098, which provides for permanency of the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6727. Also, petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, Helen S. Woodelton, chairman, conservation committee, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging defeat of the Barkley pollu-

tion bill (S. 685) and favoring the Mundt bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6728. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the new Sugar Act of 1940; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6729. Also, petition of the American Forestry Association, Washington, D. C., urging postponement of the pollution bill for another year; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6730. Also, petition of the New York Section, Inc., of Green Mountain Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging recommitment of pollution bill and defeat of the Barkley bill (S. 685); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6731. Also, petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the continuance of the present Sugar Act, which protects home industry and home employment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6732. Also, petition of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Chicago, Ill., urging recommitment of Senate bill 685, the Barkley pollution bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6733. Also, petition of the Lincoln Women's Republican Club of St. Albans, Inc., St. Albans, Long Island, N. Y., favoring continuation of the present Sugar Act as a protection to those engaged in the refined-sugar industry in Brooklyn; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6734. By Mr. RANKIN: Two memorials of the Legislature of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6735. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., commending Capt. Joseph A. Gainard for his efficient handling of the situation when his ship, the *City of Flint* was captured by the Germans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6736. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, opposing the Mead bill, to create an Industrial Loan Corporation, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6737. Also, petition of the Marion County Industrial Union Council, Labor Temple, Fairmont, W. Va., favoring certain amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6738. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Arthur G. Coons and others, Claremont College, Claremont, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6739. Also, petition of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to resolution on anti-alien legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we praise Thee that the essence of life is divine. Made in His image is the immortal word in the front door of Thy Holy Book. Help us not to belittle the past nor curtain the future. This old, old truth may we never deny. It is as ancient as the heart of the Almighty, yet as new as the last aspiration that reaches the throne of grace. Not in dumb resignation, dear Lord, do we lift our hearts in prayer, but to enjoy the unbroken inflows of fresh, new wonder while eternity's flame burns deep in our breasts. Do Thou impart to blind, mortal eyes the abiding assurance that, however dark the night, the shadow-draped hills but conceal the brighter dawn. Inspire us to unveil the cross and see infinite love struggling for expression and learn that mercy is greater than sacrifice and that truth is more wonderful than fiction. Blessed be Thy holy name; these will live until the stars grow cold and the leaves of the judgment book unfold. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to acquire certain lands at St. Petersburg, Fla.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 643. An act authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaialet Reservation, State of Washington; and

S. 1935. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

FEBRUARY 29, 1940.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

*Speaker, United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Very sincerely,

JOE B. BATES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION—NEAL AGAINST KEFAUVER

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Elections No. 1, and ordered to be printed:

FEBRUARY 29, 1940.

The SPEAKER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: This office has unofficial knowledge of the bringing of a contest growing out of the special election held September 13, 1939, to fill the vacancy in the Seventy-sixth Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of Tennessee.

On October 19, 1939, John R. Neal served notice on Estes Kefauver, returned Member from the Third Congressional District of the State of Tennessee, of his purpose to contest the election of said Kefauver. Now comes the sitting Member, Estes Kefauver, in communication to me under date of February 23, 1940, moving to dismiss the said contest and sets forth the reasons therefor.

For the information of the House the Clerk deems it proper to state that no testimony in behalf of either party has been filed in this office as required and in the manner prescribed by law. The time prescribed by law for the taking of testimony having long since expired and no testimony having been transmitted to the Clerk of the House, it would, therefore, appear that this case has abated.

The motion to dismiss the contest is submitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.
By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.*

MESSENGER TO HOUSE RADIO PRESS GALLERY

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 355), as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 199, adopted by the House of Representatives on May 23, 1939, is amended by striking out the comma following the word "gallery" and the words "the services of the messenger to be provided only during the session of the Congress."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely places the messenger to the radio gallery on an annual basis rather than on a monthly basis while Congress is in session. This is a unanimous report from the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and following the legislative program of the day and the address of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXCESS RESERVES OF BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the excess reserve of banks and that the banks are just bursting with money. At the end of 1939 all the member banks in this Nation had excess reserves aggregating \$5,166,566,000, but of this \$5,166,563,000, \$3,002,856,000 is in a few banks in New York City. So, from 80 to 85 percent of these excess reserves are in five States. It is not a very healthy situation for them to be concentrated in the hands of a few people in a few large banks. Upon these excess reserves loans equal to 7 to 1 can be made. But most of the reserves are in one city, and without a stock-market boom—which we do not want for the purpose of inflation—they will not be put to work. If these reserves were distributed in a better way among all the banks of the Nation, more loans and of the proper kind would be made. I repeat that it is against the interest of the country for a few men, who control a few banks, to control the value of money, which establishes the value of everything else. The problems of money and monopoly have not been solved. Last week the excess reserves of member banks increased \$60,000,000, but all this increase was in New York City banks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and certain tables on excess reserves which were prepared by Mr. E. A. Goldenweiser, Director of Research and Statistics of the Federal Reserve Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The letter and matter referred to are as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 28, 1940.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: In reply to your request of February 19, I am enclosing four tables giving the following statistics:

1. Required reserves, excess reserves, and the percentage of excess reserves to required reserves at the end of each year, 1934-39, for central reserve city member banks, reserve city member banks, and country member banks.
2. Balances carried by the various groups of banks on deposit with other domestic banks, and also deposits held by member banks for other domestic banks at the end of each year, 1934-39.
3. Required reserves and excess reserves for the three classes of member banks before and after the four dates on which reserve requirements were changed.
4. Excess reserves of member banks by individual States for the end of 1939.

The percentage of excess reserves to required reserves is given in table 1 for each class of member bank, because these percentage figures show the relative distribution of excess reserves. In analyzing the distribution of excess reserves by classes of member banks account should be taken of the amount of balances carried with correspondent banks, because banks, and particularly country banks, deposit a large amount of their idle funds with banks in other cities. As shown in table 2, balances carried by country member banks with their correspondents are now at the record level of \$2,600,000,000. This may be compared with an average level of about \$1,000,000,000 during the period 1924-31. Reserve city banks also carry substantial balances with correspondents, but at the same time they hold balances for other banks, and withdrawal of the latter is likely to be met by drawing upon the former. New York City banks, which have the largest amounts of excess reserves, also hold very large deposits of other banks. In effect, New York banks are carrying part of the excess reserves of other banks.

If there is any more information you need, do not hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

E. A. GOLDENWEISER,
Director of Research and Statistics.

TABLE 1.—Reserves of member banks
[In millions of dollars]

End of year	All member banks	Central reserve city banks	Reserve city banks	Country banks
Required reserves:				
1934.....	2,301	1,121	724	456
1935.....	2,736	1,445	858	433
1936.....	4,632	2,384	1,496	753
1937.....	5,793	2,870	1,897	1,026
1938.....	5,511	2,911	1,724	876
1939.....	6,437	3,593	1,944	900
Excess reserves:				
1934.....	1,781	870	544	366
1935.....	2,837	1,606	737	494
1936.....	1,939	832	612	494
1937.....	1,212	464	413	335
1938.....	3,184	2,076	630	477
1939.....	5,167	3,315	1,174	678
Excess as percent of required:				
1934.....	77.4	77.6	75.1	80.3
1935.....	103.7	111.1	85.9	114.1
1936.....	41.9	34.9	40.9	65.6
1937.....	20.9	16.2	21.8	32.7
1938.....	57.8	71.3	36.5	54.5
1939.....	80.3	92.3	60.4	75.3

TABLE 2.—Interbank deposits
[In millions of dollars]

End of year	All member banks	Central reserve city banks	Reserve city banks	Country banks
Balances carried by member banks with other domestic banks (member and nonmember):				
1934.....	3,149	310	1,543	1,296
1935.....	3,776	320	1,779	1,676
1936.....	4,066	321	1,816	1,929
1937.....	3,414	299	1,470	1,645
1938.....	4,240	344	1,940	1,956
1939.....	5,506	407	2,485	2,614
Deposits held by member banks for other domestic banks (member and nonmember):				
1934.....	4,703	2,244	2,101	358
1935.....	5,847	2,860	2,556	431
1936.....	6,555	3,092	2,963	499
1937.....	5,565	2,636	2,496	433
1938.....	6,642	3,345	2,827	469
1939.....	8,662	4,422	3,633	597

TABLE 3.—Reserve position of member banks when reserve requirements were changed

[In millions of dollars; based on averages of daily figures for the half month before and after change]

Date of change in reserve requirements	All member banks	Central reserve city banks	Reserve city banks	Country banks
Aug. 16, 1936:				
Required reserves (Aug. 1-15).....	2,958	1,558	929	471
Required reserves (Aug. 16-31).....	4,440	2,322	1,404	714
Increase.....	+1,482	+764	+475	+243
Excess reserves (Aug. 1-15).....	3,105	1,516	970	619
Excess reserves (Aug. 16-31).....	1,852	760	601	490
Mar. 1, 1937:				
Required reserves (Feb. 16-28).....	4,595	2,364	1,474	757
Required reserves (Mar. 1-15).....	5,357	2,751	1,717	888
Increase.....	+762	+387	+243	+131
Excess reserves (Feb. 16-28).....	2,139	985	642	513
Excess reserves (Mar. 1-15).....	1,364	432	497	435
May 1, 1937:				
Required reserves (Apr. 16-30).....	5,279	2,674	1,714	890
Required reserves (May 1-15).....	6,012	3,020	1,963	1,029
Increase.....	+733	+346	+249	+139
Excess reserves (Apr. 16-30).....	1,623	708	495	420
Excess reserves (May 1-15).....	911	225	324	363
Apr. 16, 1938:				
Required reserves (Apr. 1-15).....	5,740	2,881	1,860	1,000
Required reserves (Apr. 16-30).....	5,056	2,603	1,618	835
Decrease.....	-684	-278	-242	-165
Excess reserves (Apr. 1-15).....	1,619	738	488	394
Excess reserves (Apr. 16-30).....	2,523	1,323	730	471

TABLE 4.—Excess reserves of member banks, Dec. 30, 1939
[In thousands of dollars]

All member banks.....	5,166,566
New England:	
Maine.....	8,081
New Hampshire.....	3,059
Vermont.....	3,402
Massachusetts.....	194,876
Rhode Island.....	20,431
Connecticut.....	26,886
Middle Atlantic:	
New York.....	3,002,856
New Jersey.....	66,097
Pennsylvania.....	391,972
East North Central:	
Ohio.....	184,344
Indiana.....	28,767
Illinois.....	493,697
Michigan.....	80,322
Wisconsin.....	43,835
West North Central:	
Minnesota.....	38,246
Iowa.....	10,835
Missouri.....	89,262
North Dakota.....	934
South Dakota.....	2,935
Nebraska.....	10,274
Kansas.....	9,726
South Atlantic:	
Delaware.....	3,012
Maryland.....	28,987
District of Columbia.....	29,795
Virginia.....	30,390
West Virginia.....	8,591
North Carolina.....	7,547
South Carolina.....	3,247
Georgia.....	9,125
Florida.....	8,876
East South Central:	
Kentucky.....	11,059
Tennessee.....	10,516
Alabama.....	12,851
Mississippi.....	3,273
West South Central:	
Arkansas.....	9,707
Louisiana.....	16,589
Oklahoma.....	18,462
Texas.....	74,789
Mountain:	
Montana.....	10,421
Idaho.....	1,806
Wyoming.....	3,763
Colorado.....	30,195
New Mexico.....	2,341
Arizona.....	1,219
Utah.....	6,321
Nevada.....	1,020
Pacific:	
Washington.....	9,641
Oregon.....	4,946
California.....	97,240

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have asked for this time, Mr. Speaker, to inquire as to the program for next week. I wonder if the Chair would take the House into his confidence at this time on that matter?

The SPEAKER. In answer to the inquiry, the Chair may say that, of course, it is the custom for the majority leader to make such announcements, but, inasmuch as he is temporarily detained with a cold, the Chair takes the liberty of stating that the program, as far as any program has been arranged, will be this: On Monday next, of course, there will be the call of the Consent Calendar and suspensions, if any. The Chair will state that at this time he has it in mind not to recognize any Member for suspensions. It is hoped that on Monday afternoon, or at least on Tuesday, we will begin consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, which will probably consume 2 or 3 days. That is as far as any program has been arranged for next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Commissioner Collier on S. 3083.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Russell B. Brown before the Cole subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY TEXAS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the House is not likely to be in session tomorrow, and inasmuch as March 2 is the one hundred and fourth anniversary of the declaration of independence by Texas, I have asked for this minute to say a few words and to present a unanimous-consent request.

In its statement of grievances the declaration of independence by Texas resembles in many respects the Declaration of Independence written by Thomas Jefferson for the Thirteen Colonies. It is a very important and significant American historical document. In its consequences it had a vast effect upon the development of this country in which we live. I believe it has never been made generally available for perusal by the people of this country or even by the Members of Congress. The original of this declaration is in the capitol building in Austin. I have a copy of this document, which is comparatively brief, and in view of its importance and significance I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that it may be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE MADE BY THE DELEGATES OF THE PEOPLE OF TEXAS IN GENERAL CONVENTION AT THE TOWN OF WASHINGTON ON THE 2D DAY OF MARCH 1836

When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the people, from whom its legitimate powers are derived, and for the advancement of whose happiness it was instituted; and, so far from being a guaranty for the enjoyment of their inestimable and inalienable rights, becomes an instrument in the hands of evil rulers for their oppression. When the Federal republican constitution of their country, which they have sworn to support, no longer has a substantial existence; and the whole nature of their government has been forcibly changed, without their consent, from a restricted federative republic, composed of sovereign States, to a consolidated, central, military despotism in which every interest is disregarded but that of the army and the priesthood—both the eternal enemies of civil liberty, the ever-ready minions of power, and the usual instruments of tyrants. When, long after the spirit of the constitution has departed, moderation is, at length, so far lost by those in power that even the semblance of freedom is removed, and the forms themselves of the constitution discontinued; and, so far from their petitions and remonstrances being regarded, the agents who bear them are thrown into dungeons, and mercenary armies sent forth to force a new government upon them at the point of the bayonet. When, in consequence of such acts of malfeasance and abdication on the part of the government, anarchy prevails and civil society is dissolved into its original elements. In such a crisis the first law of Nature, the right of self-preservation—the inherent and inalienable right of the people to appeal to first principles and take their political affairs into their own hands in extreme cases—enjoins it, as a right toward themselves and a sacred obligation to their posterity, to abolish such government and create another in its stead, calculated to rescue them from impending dangers and to secure their future welfare and happiness.

Nations, as well as individuals, are amenable for their acts to the public opinion of mankind. A statement of a part of our grievances is, therefore, submitted to an impartial world in justification of the hazardous but unavoidable step now taken of severing our political connection with the Mexican people and assuming an independent attitude among the nations of the earth.

The Mexican Government, by its colonization laws, invited and induced the Anglo-American population of Texas to colonize its wilderness, under the pledged faith of a written constitution that they should continue to enjoy that constitutional liberty and republican government to which they had been habituated in the land of their birth, the United States of America.

In this expectation they have been cruelly disappointed, inasmuch as the Mexican Nation has acquiesced in the late changes made in the Government by Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, who, having overturned the constitution of his country, now offers us the cruel alternative either to abandon our homes, acquired by so many privations, or submit to the most intolerable of all tyranny—the combined despotism of the sword and the priesthood.

It has sacrificed our welfare to the State of Coahuila, by which our interests have been continually depressed through a jealous and partial course of legislation carried on at a far-distant seat of government by a hostile majority in an unknown tongue; and this, too, notwithstanding we have petitioned in the humblest terms for the establishment of a separate State government, and have, in accordance with the provisions of the national constitution, presented to the General Congress a republican constitution, which was, without just cause, contemptuously rejected.

It incarcerated in a dungeon for a long time one of our citizens, for no other cause but a zealous endeavor to procure the acceptance of our constitution and the establishment of a State government.

It has failed and refused to secure, on a firm basis, the right of trial by jury—that palladium of civil liberty, and only safe guaranty for the life, liberty, and property of the citizen.

It has failed to establish any public system of education, although possessed of almost boundless resources (the public domain), and although it is an axiom in political science that unless a people are educated and enlightened, it is idle to expect the continuance of civil liberty or the capacity for self-government.

It has suffered the military commandants stationed among us to exercise arbitrary acts of oppression and tyranny, thus trampling upon the most sacred rights of the citizen and rendering the military superior to the civil power.

It has dissolved, by force of arms, the State Congress of Coahuila and Texas and obliged our representatives to fly for their lives from the seat of government, thus depriving us of the fundamental political right of representation.

It has demanded the surrender of a number of our citizens and ordered military detachments to seize and carry them into the interior for trial, in contempt of the civil authorities and in defiance of the laws and the constitution.

It has made piratical attacks upon our commerce by commissioning foreign desperadoes and authorizing them to seize our vessels and convey the property of our citizens to far distant ports for confiscation.

It denies us the right of worshiping the Almighty according to the dictates of our own conscience by the support of a national religion calculated to promote the temporal interest of its human functionaries rather than the glory of the true and living God.

It has demanded us to deliver up our arms, which are essential to our defense, the rightful property of freemen, and formidable only to tyrannical governments.

It has invaded our country, both by sea and by land, with intent to lay waste our territory and drive us from our homes, and has now a large mercenary army advancing to carry on against us a war of extermination.

It has, through its emissaries, incited the merciless savage, with tomahawk and scalping knife, to massacre the inhabitants of our defenseless frontiers.

It hath been, during the whole time of our connection with it, the contemptible sport and victim of successive military revolutions, and hath continually exhibited every characteristic of a weak, corrupt, and tyrannical government.

These and other grievances were patiently borne by the people of Texas until they reached that point at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue. We then took up arms in defense of the national constitution. We appealed to our Mexican brethren for assistance. Our appeal has been made in vain. Though months have elapsed, no sympathetic response has yet been heard from the interior. We are therefore forced to the melancholy conclusion that the Mexican people have acquiesced in the destruction of their liberty and the substitution therefor of a military government—that they are unfit to be free and incapable of self-government.

The necessity of self-preservation, therefore, now decrees our eternal political separation.

We, therefore, the delegates, with plenary powers, of the people of Texas, in solemn convention assembled, appealing to a candid world for the necessities of our condition, do hereby resolve and declare that our political connection with the Mexican nation has forever ended; and that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign and independent republic, and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent nations; and, conscious of the rectitude of our intentions, we fearlessly and confidently commit the issue to the decision of the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of nations.

Richard Ellis, President of the Convention; Charles B. Stewart, Thos. Barnett; John S. D. Byrom; Francisco Ruiz; J. Antonio Navarro; Jesse B. Badgett; Wm. D. Lacey; William Menefee; Jno. Fisher; Mathew Caldwell; William Motley; Lorenzo De Zavala; Stephen H. Everitt; Geo. W. Smyth; Elijah Stapp; Claiborne West; Wm. B. Scates; M. B. Menard; A. B. Hardin; J. W. Bunton; Thos. J. Gazley; R. M. Coleman; Sterling C. Robertson; Jas.

Collinsworth; Edwin Waller; Asa Brigham; Geo. C. Childress; Bailey Hardeman; Robt. Potter; Thomas Jefferson Rusk; Chas. S. Taylor; John S. Roberts; Robert Hamilton; Collin McKinney; Albert H. Latimer; James Power; Sam Houston; David Thomas; Edw. Conrad; Martin Farmer; Edwin O. LeGrand; Stephen W. Blount; Jas. Gaines; Wm. Clark, Jr.; Sydney O. Penington; Wm. Carrol Crawford; Jno. Turner; Benj. Briggs Goodrich; G. W. Barnett; James G. Swisher; Jesse Grimes; S. Rhoads Fisher; John W. Moore; John W. Bower; Saml. A. Maverick; Sam P. Carson; A. Briscoe; J. B. Woods. Test: H. S. Kimble, Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include statements which I made before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief report of the operations of the Farm Security Administration for the past year in the Fifth Congressional District of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] at the annual beefsteak dinner of the Columbia Club at Indianapolis, Ind., on February 19, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to be made in Committee today by including therein an article by Herman G. Baity. It may slightly exceed two pages of the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE PEOPLE MUST PUT AN END TO THIS SPENDTHRIFT ERA IN GOVERNMENT OR WE PERISH

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while we read in the newspapers of how some spendthrift son or daughter has gone through an inheritance or fortune left to him or her by some benefactor who, as he slaved and saved, believed the recipient of the benefactions would use the gift conservatively and wisely.

Today, as I look at the Treasury Department statement for February 27, I am reminded of these spendthrifts.

So far this fiscal year our Government has gone \$2,628,259,772 in the red. Unless we cut down this deficit spending by June 30 next, we will have run the year's deficit to over \$4,000,000,000. Future historians will no doubt call this the spendthrift age in government.

But, Mr. Speaker, whatever the historians record, they will place the blame upon the Members of Congress who have been appropriating money for all kinds of schemes and projects faster than the expanding bureaus and agencies of the Government can spend it and almost twice as fast as the Congress and the Treasury Department can devise ways and means to collect the needed additional revenues to balance the Federal Budget.

So we have had to resort to borrowing; and our borrowing has been from the money changers—the national and international bankers, if you please, against whom Mr. Roosevelt so loudly declaimed in the campaign of 1932. May I now in-

vite your attention to the fact that, instead of driving the money changers from the temple, they have built the money changers a new marble palace down on Constitution Avenue, where they sit in complacent glee and survey their doubly secure holdings.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, what a farce and sham the New Deal has made of our Government.

Oh, what debauchery has been committed in the name of democracy.

Oh, what a heavy burden has been placed upon the present and yet unborn generations of our people.

Shame upon you, spendthrifts. Shame upon you. The people must surely put an end to this spendthrift era this November or we perish.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table showing the parity payments that have been made since the inception of the program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to insert an address of Robert C. Bassett delivered at La Crosse, Wis., on February 19, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Times Tribune of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short letter from a farm leader in Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, something like a year ago I stood on this floor and talked about the cow. For the first time, I think, in the history of this Congress or any other Congress, there was revealed to many people, who believed that the only things produced in the United States were cotton, corn, wheat, and oats, the fact that there was a cow and she had four tubes and it took 17,600,000 pulls on those tubes in order to produce the milk.

Wisconsin cattle produced nearly 12,000,000,000 pounds of milk last year. This is about 11 percent of all the milk produced in the United States and it is an all-time high point in Wisconsin's milk production, according to the crop reporting service.

Estimates indicate that there were 2,108,000 head of producing cows on Wisconsin farms during 1939, which is a larger milk-cow population than shown for 1938. The average milk production per cow of 5,680 pounds was a little below the average for 1938, and the increase in the total milk production compared with 1938 came from the greater number of milk cows. The total milk production in the State last year was about 1 percent greater than in 1938.

With 11,973,000,000 pounds of milk produced on Wisconsin farms, the State continued its lead in milk production by a wide margin. Minnesota ranked second with 8,160,000,000 pounds and New York ranked third with 7,465,000,000 pounds.

Milk production for the Nation as a whole in 1939 was estimated at 108,558,000,000 pounds, which was somewhat above the production of 1938 when the number of milk cows was somewhat smaller. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a brief news story on the subject of stream pollution from the Des Moines Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address given by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] at a Republican rally in Chicago on February 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a compilation of statistics concerning income-tax payers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a resolution from the Chamber of Commerce of Fall River, Mass., protesting against the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this brief period to ask those who always stand ready to laud President Roosevelt and denounce the Republican Presidents before him what in the world Mr. Roosevelt would have done if those Republican Presidents had run the Government like he has run it?

Suppose the Republican administrations from 1920 to 1932 had used up all of the credit of the Nation for the past, present, and future, as has Mr. Roosevelt? Could he have become the Nation's spendingest President? Certainly not.

Summed up, Mr. Roosevelt and his followers are always blaming and finding fault with the very thing that made it possible for him to be a spending President. In my opinion, Mr. Roosevelt and his criticizing followers have continuously shown poor sportsmanship.

OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill in relation to occupational diseases in this country, principally for the consideration and study of the present and the next

Congress. I ask unanimous consent in this connection to submit a statement in respect thereto in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman speaks about occupational diseases. I think what we ought to do is to have a complete diagnosis of what has been happening in the last 7 years, due to the efforts of this administration, and if we do, then the gentleman will want to have an operation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Simply to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania by saying that if he can look into and gage my mental processes he is a better man than I have ever suspected him of being. But I doubt his ability along that line as I do along so many others.

The purpose of this bill is to aid the States in the control of occupational diseases, that is, disabling conditions from exposures encountered in employment, by effecting better control of these hazards through maintaining special industrial hygiene units in State labor departments, these industrial hygiene divisions to function first by designing and applying engineering control measures to existing exposures; second, by aiding in the preparation of suitable rules and regulations for prevention and by directly aiding the enforcement agency charged with the application of the rules and regulations; third, by aiding the State adjudicating agency in the disposition of workmen's compensation claims.

Occupational diseases occur in all 48 States. Although the extent of damage to workers' health as a result of job hazards varies according to the nature and concentration of industry, this is definitely a Nation-wide problem.

No industrial employment is free from conditions capable of causing sickness, disability, and premature death. The industrial worker's life expectancy is 8 to 10 years less than the population at large.

Most seriously exposed are the estimated 5,000,000 workers menaced by specific, recurring, recognized occupational diseases, that is, lead poisoning, dermatitis, silicosis, asbestosis, poisoning from benzol, carbon disulphide, mercury, radium, carbon monoxide, and about 20 more.

Increasing use of new chemicals, new solvents, new processes are not only bringing new diseases but are producing an alarming increase in the known health disabilities.

Numerous surveys showing the extent of the hazard have been made. Half of the States recognize from 1 to 31 predominant occupational diseases in Workmen's Compensation Act schedules. Medical techniques have been developed to appraise and sometimes alleviate the damage, but preventive programs are wholly inadequate in some States and nonexistent in others. This is due primarily to insufficient funds available to the responsible enforcement agency, that is, the State labor departments.

While health departments in the several States have jurisdiction over the public health—contagious diseases, water supply, sewage disposal—this is a general authority, not specifically related to industry.

In virtually every State in the Union there has been set up by law a labor department or industrial commission charged with the duty of regulating working conditions and authorized to enter places of employment in the enforcement of labor laws, rules, and regulations. These agencies have specific authority and responsibility with respect to prevention of industrial accident and disease.

In three States—New York, Massachusetts, and Illinois—industrial hygiene units which deal exclusively with the science of protecting the worker's health have been integrated with State labor departments and operate wholly on State funds.

Under the Social Security Act of 1935 the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service has allotted Federal funds to 25 States and 3 city health departments for research in the field of industrial hygiene and sanitation. None of these industrial hygiene units in the health departments renders service to labor departments in any one of the following ways: First, actual enforcement of detailed rules or laws; second, adjudication of workmen's compensation claims; third, directly aiding in the formulation of administrative codes, rules, and regulations.

If industrial hygiene work is to serve a practical purpose other than the mere development of scientific information, it must be carried out by an agency integrated with the department of labor which has full responsibility for and jurisdiction over protecting the health of workers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 685) to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 685, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire the status of the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN] has consumed 29 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SEGER] has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, primarily for the information of those not in the Chamber yesterday, and who have not followed the developments of this pollution legislation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I rise to make a few remarks in the 5 minutes allotted to me. Speaking, first of all, as one of those who has been active in opposition to S. 685 up until yesterday and who has been urging Members of the House to recommit S. 685 for further consideration, I wish to explain why we have changed our attitude toward that bill. It has been the contention of the conservationists throughout the country, the Izaak Walton League, the American Audubon Society, and others, that it is better to have no legislation on pollution at all than to have legislation which does not make some direct improvement in the situation. However, I am happy to advise the House again that yesterday a compromise amendment was agreed to between certain members of the committee and those most interested in my pollution bill, H. R. 7971. At this conference we agreed on an amended version of the amendment which I was going to offer to the committee's bill, which is satisfactory both to the conservationists, and, I understand, to a vast majority of the Members of the House who are interested in passing an antipollution bill at this time. We anticipate the opposition of those who are interested in protecting the so-called vested rights of polluters and deny that polluters have any vested rights in American public waters.

We were opposed to S. 865 in its original form not so much because of what it did but because of what it left undone. This amendment provides that while we study the problems under the provisions of Senate bill 865 we shall invoke regulations preventing new sources of pollution.

It seems to me we have arrived at an honest, fair compromise whereby existing polluters will be given adequate time to correct their nefarious practices, and this Congress will have declared that it is opposed to the polluting practice and will have outlawed its future extension.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. Will your amendment have the same form as that appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 1047?

Mr. MUNDT. My amendment is in this morning's RECORD. I am not sure on which page. It will not be in precisely the same form as it appeared in yesterday's RECORD, because after conference with committee members we altered it slightly, and you will find it in this morning's RECORD in the exact form and language in which I shall offer it.

I urge the Members to vote for this amendment so that both schools of thought with regard to pollution correction can unite in support of S. 865, because any legislation dealing with pollution is bound to have the opposition of certain industries, certain groups, certain manufacturers, who seem to feel that they have an inherent right to pollute the streams of America. Consequently those of us favoring progress toward clean streams must unite in this fight. My amendment rescues from H. R. 7971, which was the conservationists' bill, the bill which you were urged to vote for by various conservation organizations, the control features, insofar as they apply to nonexistent forms of pollution. This amendment prevents this Congress from taking the highly ludicrous standpoint of spending the taxpayers' money to correct a problem before we are willing to prevent the problem from growing worse so rapidly that it is fast becoming insolvable. If we are trying to correct it as it now exists, let us discontinue dumping new forms of sewage into the problem so that we will have to come back for additional taxpayers' funds to continue to study the problem which will be encouraged rather than discouraged by such innocuous legislation. It freezes the pollution problem where it is and says we shall proceed slowly, with Government assistance, in trying to find corrective methods for eliminating the present serious condition. In the meantime we shall stop putting new forms of pollution into the public waters of America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, of course, it is impossible in 5 minutes to discuss a question as broad as stream pollution. I have not read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and would have to consider that before I could say whether I would accept it or not. However, for just a minute I do wish to bring to the attention of the Committee my knowledge of the efforts to secure pollution legislation.

I have been interested in that subject since I came to Congress. I think it was 20 or 21 years ago that I appeared for the first time before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in an effort to secure some relief from pollution. Almost every year since that time there has been the same experience. The trouble up to this time has been that legislation that was submitted was too drastic in character and friends of legislation to remedy stream pollution were driven away because they could not subscribe to the features of the legislation. The bill before the House approaches the problem in a sane, constructive way in an effort to try to find some solution. If a bill such as this had been passed by the Congress immediately after my first appearance before the committee about 20 or 21 years ago many of the hardships that we now undergo and much of the pollution occurring since would have been avoided. I hope the bill as reported by the committee will pass. If the Mundt amendment is offered, I must consider the legislation further.

I want to call attention to one other thing. In the draft of the bill which has been presented to the House this morning I find in section 2, subsection (c), a provision that compacts and agreements may be entered into between the States. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the last session of Congress my committee reported out a bill providing for compacts and agreements between States with respect to fishery matters, and that bill was vetoed by the President upon the sole ground that we did not provide that the compacts and agreements should be resubmitted to the Congress before actually becoming law. In other words, the bill that we passed did not meet the approval of the President because provision was omitted that such compacts

should be referred back to the Congress for approval. I think the President was correct. We have reported again the same bill with language to take care of the omission. That bill has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. The language we added to meet the objection of the President was:

Any such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon the signatory States unless it has been approved by the legislatures of such States and by the Congress of the United States.

The bill which was vetoed, omitted only the words "and by the Congress of the United States."

What I fear is that if serious consideration is not given to an amendment such as I have suggested now and will probably offer, we may be confronted with a Presidential veto if the President follows the precedent set by him in the last session of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know what the attitude of the committee might be, but it seems to me that the gentleman's suggestion is a reasonable one. Rather than risk that veto, I think that an amendment such as the gentleman suggests ought to be presented to the House for approval. I cannot see any objection to it.

Mr. BLAND. If my time would permit, I would like to read this from the Presidential veto:

This joint resolution is not in conformity with the usual and accepted methods of granting the consent of Congress to the execution of interstate compacts or agreements in that it lacks a provision requiring the approval by the Congress of such compact or agreement as may be entered into before it shall become effective. I believe that it would be unwise to establish the policy of granting in advance the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements in connection with subjects described only in broad outline as in Senate Joint Resolution 139.

The date of the veto was August 11, 1939, and the quotation above is the pertinent portion of the message.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and also of the Special Committee on Wildlife Conservation. I approach this problem, therefore, from two viewpoints. In my own district in the western part of Oregon we are very much interested, of course, in protecting our industries which use the waterways for the disposal of their waste. I recognize, as do you gentlemen, that we must in any program we adopt with reference to the prevention of further pollution or the eradication of existing pollution in our streams recognize the interests of the commercial users insofar as possible and at the same time preserve public health, fish, and wildlife. On the other hand, we should clearly adopt a program which will not only preserve those interests but will also protect an equally large interest, the right of the public, to have these great waterways of our country flow through their natural courses as little polluted as possible. We realize under existing conditions, with large cities bordering most of these streams and with great industrial enterprises, pulp mills, manufacturing concerns, and mines such as we have in the West, using the streams, that certain pollution is bound to take place. But it seems to those of us on the committee who have given this matter considerable consideration that we can reach a common ground where all interested parties and the public interest may be protected.

We in the West pride ourselves on our wonderfully fine waterways, lakes, and mountain streams. They constitute one of our chief assets in attracting to our communities tourists to enjoy themselves in fishing, outdoor sports, bathing, and otherwise using these fine waterways in which the West abounds. Not only are they useful and profitable for purposes of recreation, but also we want to attract great industries to use them. The Federal Government is spending large sums to develop many of them for transportation. Personally, I am convinced that the compromise, which now seems largely to have been arrived at by members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, is a step forward in the

solution of this problem. It does not go far enough to suit some and too far for others. I favor the committee amendment, which will be offered when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, and also the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I wish to read the first sentence of the Mundt amendment. It is short. It appears in the Appendix of the Record at page 1097.

After the date of the enactment of this act no new sources of pollution either of sewage or industrial waste shall be permitted to be discharged into the navigable waterways of the United States and streams tributary thereto until and unless approved by the division.

That division is the board set up within existing boards which we already have. It will not entail any additional expense, but will provide opportunity for men who are already charged with responsibility of protecting public health and industry to see that any attempt to pollute streams in the future may be stopped so far as possible. This is a beginning, at least.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of stream pollution has come to be one of the problems of major importance throughout the United States, and there is scarcely a community of any size bordering upon any of our waterways that has not been seriously affected by pollution. It is true that very material improvement has been made in some communities in meeting this problem; however, it is not a problem confined within a single State, but spreads across State lines by reason of its effect upon interstate waterways. Under the commerce clause of the Constitution the Federal Government is involved.

This bill, while it is considered by some as ineffective in meeting the situation, nevertheless is an advance and will give an opportunity to formulate plans and programs and financing through Federal cooperation with the States that gives promise of real effectiveness, eventually leading to a solution of the problem. Its most effective provision is the one regulating new pollution.

In Oregon, my own State, we realized the necessity of providing effective methods for reducing stream pollution and by a vote of the people have adopted measures which will eventually give our State real relief. All of the organizations in our community interested in wildlife conservation, such as the Izaak Walton League, have been active in a campaign to have enacted legislation along the line of the Mundt bill.

The committee amendment, whether amended by the Mundt amendment now pending or not, does not go as far as these organizations would prefer. Nevertheless, I feel we should be willing to accept the compromise by adopting the committee amendment with the Mundt amendment thereto.

I shall support that program, and urge all of you who are interested in taking a step forward in preventing further pollution of our streams to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, in the House this morning, before we went into the Committee of the Whole, I secured permission to extend an article by Herman G. Baity on this subject, which I wish to follow my remarks at this point.

The matter referred to follows:

ASPECTS OF GOVERNMENTAL POLICY ON STREAM POLLUTION ABATEMENT
(By Herman G. Baity, Sc. D., F. A. P. H. A., professor of sanitary engineering, division of public health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.)

(Read before the public health engineering section of the American Public Health Association at the sixty-eighth annual meeting in Pittsburgh, Pa., October 18, 1939)

All persons and agencies interested in the stream conservation problem are mutually agreed that there exists in this country a pollution situation that is most undesirable and uneconomic; that such conditions are so widespread as to constitute a major national concern; and that such remedial and preventive measures should be taken as to protect the public health, preserve public decency, conserve the wild-life resources, and promote the use of natural waters for wholesome recreational purposes. It is ironical and unfortunate that some of these agencies, whose interests and objectives are common, should differ so widely and fight so bitterly over ways and means of accomplishing desirable ends. The greatest contribution that can be made to the cause would be the encouragement of a dispassionate consideration of the opposing points of view and a reconciliation of differences. During the recent session of Congress there have been evidences that feelings are running so high as to develop bitter prejudices, cause misrepresentations of facts, and encourage the widespread release of misleading propaganda.

The proper legislative solution of this vexing problem, which requires the ultimate in vision and perspective, should take place in an atmosphere that is clear and calm.

Before considering the opposing points of view or attempting to weigh existing differences, it would be well, perhaps, to reflect briefly upon the fundamental uses of streams and the general nature of the pollution problem.

THE NECESSARY USES OF STREAMS

The uses to which streams and other natural bodies of water are put are many and various, serving in as many ways the needs of our individual and national life. Due to geographical and topographical conditions, the river basin becomes a kind of closed community so far as water uses are concerned. The stream becomes the source for domestic and industrial water supply, irrigation, and hydroelectric power developments; it serves the needs of recreational facilities; it provides the habitat for fish, shellfish, and water fowl; it furnishes the medium for water transportation; and provides the vehicle for the carrying away and ultimate disposal of the liquid wastes originating from our community life and industrial processes.

The use of a natural water course for the reception and disposal of liquid wastes is as necessary and legitimate as its use for any other purpose, subject to definite limitations. If such use renders the river unfit as the source of present or potential public water supplies, offends the senses, endangers health, inhibits the growth of wildlife, prevents its use for recreation, or obstructs navigation, the development of the drainage area will, as a result, be hindered or even stopped, and all people and properties within the area will suffer. But in emphasizing this danger one must not overlook the possible economic consequences which would result if overzealous demands for a pristine degree of stream cleanliness required a degree of sewage and waste treatment that would be prohibitory to municipal and private enterprise.

The proper balance of stream uses is different for every stream, and for each, depending upon conditions, there is one combination which is most logical and economical. Such a policy does not mean that our water courses need become or remain open sewers. In every case public decency and economy demand a degree of cleanliness sufficient to avoid nuisance conditions, provide recreational facilities, support useful aquatic life, protect the public health, and preserve the natural beauties of water. The solution of the problem lies in true conservation, which implies the maximum possible judicious uses of the many properties of streams, such uses to be evaluated from a consideration of the broad demands of the public welfare. It does not lie in any simple statutory device which attempts to regulate water quality upon the basis of a single water use.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT A PECULIAR PROBLEM

A complicating factor in dealing with stream pollution is the fact that the municipal or private agency making an outlay of money for pollution abatement is not the one which benefits directly from the expenditure. It is the downstream riparian owners and users of water who suffer from the pollution, or who reap the benefits of its abatement. In an age of exploitation of natural resources this peculiar fact has, quite understandably, caused both public and private polluters of water to dump their wastes in the easiest and least expensive manner, leaving the unpleasant consequences to the users of water on the streams below. In the past they have too often ignored the public interest and the welfare of succeeding generations and have shunned the responsibility of providing pollution relief.

But the days of pioneer exploitation and the advancing frontier are gone. The growth of densely populated and highly industrialized areas has tremendously increased liquid pollution, while the rainfall has remained practically constant, and normal stream flow has actually diminished under the influences of modern land use. The resulting condition is not limited in its effects to esthetics, recreation, or public health; the economic consequences are being felt. Many industries requiring water of high quality for modern processes of manufacture are already suffering great losses by reason of its defilement by their own wastes, or those of sister industries.

It is high time that serious cognizance be taken of the condition and value of the Nation's streams and plans laid for the sanitary redemption of some and for the continued protection of others, plans not only for the present but for the decades and centuries which are ahead.

EXTENT OF THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

The Third Report of the Special Advisory Committee on Water Pollution of the National Resources Committee, presented to Congress by President Roosevelt on February 15, 1939, contains the most accurate available data regarding the present status of the pollution problem. It estimates that 73,174,000 people of the United States were served by public sewerage systems as of August 1938, which represents 56 percent of the 129,818,000 estimated population of the country at that time.

This sewerage population discharges daily approximately five and three-fourths billion gallons of liquid wastes, practically all of which finds its way, treated or untreated, into streams, lakes, and tidal estuaries. This enormous flow represents, however, less than one-half percent of the average daily flow of the streams of the country. The sewage from about 19,000,000 persons is subjected to primary treatment of sedimentation, while an additional 20,700,000 persons are tributary to secondary treatment plants. This total population of 39,700,000 served by some type of treatment works represents about 54 percent of the sewerage population, or approxi-

mately 31 percent of the country's total population. In terms of volume, roughly two and one-half billion gallons of sewage are discharged daily in an untreated condition into water courses, while about three and one-fourth billion gallons per day receive treatment prior to discharge. However, it should be borne in mind that these statistics do not paint a true picture of the sewage pollution problem. The special advisory committee is careful to point out that it is not essential that all sewage receive complete treatment and that, under certain conditions, no treatment may be necessary or desirable.

In the field of mining wastes, the committee estimates that annually about 2,700,000 tons of sulfuric acid entered streams as drainage from bituminous coal mines prior to the recent widespread campaign of sealing abandoned workings. From anthracite mining large quantities of culm and acid drainage also find their way into the water courses of this district. The oil fields are estimated to produce daily about 10,000,000 barrels of brine, a considerable part of which drains into streams. In some sections of the country hydraulic mining operations continue to contribute materially to the silting of stream channels.

A great variety and volume of liquid wastes are discharged from industrial plants into the streams of the country. No reliable estimates are available as to their amounts, or their specific characteristics and effects, but the committee rated them in descending order of importance as follows: Food products, paper and pulp, textiles, petroleum products, and metallurgical products. These wastes are harmful to the receiving streams in a number of ways. They may contain substances causing disease; they may impart obnoxious tastes, odors, and colors, which are repulsive to the senses, render the water unsuitable for industrial purposes, corrode structures, prevent recreational use of the stream, and inhibit the development of fish and other forms of wildlife.

COST OF POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The special committee estimates that the further cost of treatment works to bring about a reasonable abatement of water pollution would involve an expenditure of approximately \$1,000,000,000 for municipal sewage treatment, about \$52,000,000 for the control of coal-mine drainage, not less than \$100,000,000 for the treatment of oil-field brine, and approximately \$900,000,000 for the treatment of industrial wastes for which practicable processes have been developed. The annual operating and maintenance costs for the new sewage-treatment plants would amount to at least \$15,000,000, while the fixed and operating charges for the treatment of mining, oil field, and industrial wastes would probably exceed \$225,000,000 per year. These estimates of the committee for installation and operation assume that optimum use would be made of the natural purification capacities of streams and that, in many situations, much waste would be discharged untreated or with only minor treatment. The complete treatment of all wastes is estimated to cost several times more than the programs outlined above. Such a degree of treatment is considered unattainable, and, even though it were possible, a program of this extent is not considered necessary.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

During the past 5 years various bills dealing with the problem of stream pollution have been introduced into Congress. These bills fall generally into two types, representing two opposing schools of thought with respect to regulation, and may be briefly summarized as follows:

The first measure dealing with pollution control was introduced into the Seventy-fourth Congress by Senator AUGUSTINE LONERGAN, of Connecticut. Largely supported by the wildlife-conservation group, the Lonergan bill provided for a central Federal regulatory agency to exercise pollution control through injunction procedures in the United States courts.

At about the same time other bills were introduced into the Senate and the House providing for Federal participation, through an existing agency, in a program of educational, research, and coordinating activities, but with regulatory control left to the States. These bills embodied the principles considered desirable by the health officials of the country, and were represented in the later Barkley-Vinson measures introduced in the Senate by Senator BARKLEY and in the House by Representative VINSON of Georgia.

Neither the Lonergan nor the Barkley-Vinson type of bill received final action during the Seventy-fourth Session, and both types reappeared during the Seventy-fifth Session. Late in this session the Vinson bill was passed by both Houses after the elimination of the drastic regulatory provisions attached to it by amendment in the Senate, and the United States Public Health Service was designated as the agency to represent the United States Government in the program. Quite surprisingly, the bill was given a pocket veto by the President on the basis of a technicality, although he voiced hearty approval of its basic objectives and principles.

The Seventy-sixth Congress saw the early introduction in the House of bills similar to the Vinson bill: H. R. 295 (PARSONS), H. R. 922 (SPENCE), and H. R. 2890 (BLAND). One similar to the Lonergan type, H. R. 4170, was introduced by Representative MUNIT. Later in February, Representative MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, introduced H. R. 4314, the bill suggested by the Advisory Committee on Water Pollution of the National Resources Committee as incorporating the best opinion of Federal planning, budgetary, health, and conservation agencies, containing all the basic principles included in the original Vinson bill, and meeting the technical objections upon which the Presidential veto had been based.

Meantime, Senator BARKLEY had submitted S. 685, the same bill as the Vinson measure of the last session with some minor revisions to remedy partially the criticisms of the President, and Senator CLARK had introduced S. 1691, another measure similar to the Loneragan bill. The Barkley measure passed the Senate with minor amendments and went to the House, where it was reported favorably after being amended to conform to Federal budgetary procedure. This bill was given clearance in preference to H. R. 6723, a revised bill later introduced by Mr. MUNDT, but the adjournment of Congress left it in the category of unfinished business. It will doubtless come before the House for action at the next regular session.

CONFLICTING POINTS OF VIEW

In general, the organized wildlife conservation groups appear to believe that the only effective machinery for pollution control is a central Federal agency vested with broad and arbitrary powers to enforce abatement orders by mandamus procedures in the Federal courts. They select the United States War Department as best qualified to administer the program. They profess a lack of confidence in the ability of State and local governments to enact adequate and uniform laws for the abatement of pollution or to enforce such laws even though they were on the statute books. Furthermore, they charge Federal and State public health agencies with an unsympathetic attitude toward pollution abatement, disparage the achievements of these organizations in preventing and relieving pollution, discount the value and applicability of their research developments, and actually accuse these public agencies of bad faith in dealing collusively with offending industry.

On the other hand, all of the public-health agencies of the country, all Federal bureaus and departments concerned with water quality and use, such planning agencies as the National Resources Planning Board, and the President of the United States, apparently favor a type of legislation which gives to the United States Public Health Service certain functions and responsibilities pertaining to research, education, stimulation, and coordination, but leaves to the States, or authorized interstate agencies, the powers of regulation and control.

Those who have had most experience with problems of this nature subscribe to this latter policy as being most logical, reasonable, and, in the long run, most productive of satisfying results. Although the advocates of rigid Federal regulation may not be entirely without justification for their impatience with existing conditions and their cynicism with respect to the future effectiveness of State control, it is believed they may be laboring under certain illusions in their active legislative campaign.

Admitting the possibility that any commentator on so controversial a subject may have predilections that sway him from a course of strict neutrality, the writer ventures to examine a few of the points at issue between the two schools of thought:

Federal against State powers—the power delegated to Congress by the commerce clause of the Constitution is limited to commerce between the several States. Under this authority the Federal Government now exercises control over the discharge of refuse matters, other than liquid wastes, into navigable waters, and the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 rests upon this clause for its constitutionality. The same justification might apply to pollution of navigable streams by domestic or industrial wastes where such discharge constituted actual and appreciable hindrances to navigation, such, for example, as sludge banks in ship channels. However, isolated cases of this kind would not appear to authorize the taking over of the entire field of pollution control by a Federal agency. Since international treaties become the supreme law of the land, without question of constitutionality, the Congress has power to control pollution insofar as necessary to fulfill treaty obligations relating to boundary waters, regardless of whether such streams are navigable or intrastate in character. The Federal Government has the power to regulate pollution on the public domain and exercises some indirect control over water quality through the "beneficial public uses" clause of the Federal Power Act. Its domestic quarantine powers give it authority to approve the safety of water used for drinking and culinary purposes on interstate carriers, and, under voluntary agreements with the various States, it enforces regulations regarding the certification of interstate shipments of shellfish. Aside from these limited powers, in the opinion of leading authorities, there appears to be no constitutional authority for Federal water-pollution control.

The authority of the States over such intrastate matters as stream pollution is well established and cannot be taken away. State legislatures, by exercise of the police power, may enact statutes relating to pollution control or may delegate to agencies of the State the authority to formulate and enforce regulations pertaining thereto. However, the Federal Government does have the authority to conduct scientific and technical investigations relating to water pollution, to cooperate with the States in an advisory capacity, and to render financial assistance to State and local authorities for investigative and construction purposes. There is strong opinion that, regardless of legal powers, this indirect type of participation by Federal agencies would result in a more effective and orderly program of pollution abatement than could possibly be achieved by Federal domination.

Efficacy of centralized control: It is only natural that those observing the sad plight of prostituted streams should infer that the trouble lies in the inefficacy of control machinery under our system of Federal and State division of responsibility. There comes the

urge to scrap the machinery and build on a different design. It appears doubtful that our State-Federal form of government is responsible in any large measure for the present situation. The pollution problem is old and world-wide, and for almost a century the countries of Europe have been wrestling with the legislative and administrative phases of pollution abatement. No nation has yet developed a workable plan for reconciling satisfactorily the various conflicting interests in natural waters to provide maximum judicious use for the greatest public benefit. It appears that the record in small highly federalized countries is no better than in those where the legislative and enforcement responsibilities are dispersed.

The explanation of the condition lies not so much in the deficiency or obsolescence of control machinery as in the extreme complexity of the problem, the multiplicity and conflict of interests, and the fact that pollution is only one phase of the larger problems of the conservation and maximum advantageous use of our water resources in general. A change in this condition will not result spontaneously from any device of centralizing power and responsibility. It may be expected to come gradually from the extension of powers on all levels of government, by fitting pollution control into its proper place in the broader control program of planned conservation and use of all water resources, by constant educational and promotional work of all interstate agencies, by relentless attacks along the whole front of the water problem by local governments under the guidance, stimulation, and participation of Federal groups, by the promulgation of interstate compacts and agreements, and by financial assistance from the Federal Government to public and private polluters requiring such aid.

Enforcement by mandate: To the provoked and impatient the correction of public evils by mandate has the appeal of being quick and effective. Regulation appears on the surface to be a simple device for curing all ills. Critics proclaim: "There ought to be a law." Perhaps it would be well to remember other times in our national life when similar evils have been observed, and when the laws designed to provide the perfect panacea proved to be unenforceable and disappointing. Moreover, those who have had occasion to invoke the police power of government in dealing with the public have long ago learned that the mailed fist is less productive than the velvet glove.

Public psychology reacts adversely to arbitrary force. Persuasion, education, and cooperation are more effective instruments than the "big stick," and the power of law should be held in reserve for exercise only when milder measures fail. The Loneragan, Clark, and Mundt types of legislation provide for actions in equity to be brought in the Federal courts and instruct United States attorneys to institute such actions when requested to do so by the Secretary of War or any one of the district boards. These bills appear to remove all existing authority of the States over sewage and waste treatment plants, and place their operation directly under the supervision of the chief of engineers, except for those waters ruled not to be navigable.

Although these bills carry provisions for cooperation with State agencies, for advisory services of other Federal agencies, for the collection and dissemination of information, and for Federal financial assistance, it is feared by many that the emphasis upon drastic control by court action would result in inadequate investigations of actual stream requirements and of the economy and applicability of treatment processes. Precipitate action without complete information would result not only in mental anguish but in the gross waste of public and private funds. Enforcement of the provisions of these measures with respect to new or additional pollution would tend to hinder industrial development and municipal growth, and might preclude the extension of sewers to presently unsewered and insanitary communities. In any case, such measures would be concerned with pollution alone and would neglect consideration of the many other related and inseparable problems of water conservation and use.

Pollution primarily a health problem: There can be no doubt that among the many objectionable and hazardous effects of water pollution the interests of the public health are paramount. Even the most ardent angler must recognize that in the general economy of a stream system the uses of water for such vital needs of life and health as public water supply and the ultimate disposal of domestic wastes are of supreme significance. And when the health interests in a stream are adequately safeguarded, there is usually the consequence that the quality standards of water for other uses are automatically met. It is therefore only reasonable and proper that the administrative responsibility for pollution control should be vested in Federal, State, and local health agencies.

In their criticism of the Barkley-Mansfield type of bill sponsors of the Mundt legislation disparage the splendid research accomplishments of the United States Public Health Service in this field and charge health agencies in general with indifference, inefficiency, and bad faith in dealing with water pollution. The charge has been made repeatedly that health organizations are in league with industrial polluters in conducting "study clubs" for the indefinite and willful delay of corrective measures. All who are acquainted with the records of the United States Public Health Service and State health departments will recognize such statements as false and libelous. There is probably no organization in the world that has excelled the record of the United States Public Health Service in the development of fundamental knowledge in the realm of stream pollution, water and sewage treatment during its 26 years

of intensive and basic research on these subjects. The critics appear to be so unacquainted with the technical bases of pollution abatement as to fail even to recognize that the scientific problems are difficult, complex, and slow of solution. They remind the writer of an impatient textile executive who said that he could take a good chemist and solve all the waste-treatment problems in his industry in 30 minutes.

Army engineers or Public Health Service: Sponsors of the Mundt and Clark bills insist that Federal control be vested in the War Department in the interest of rigid enforcement, and cite many other reasons why the Army engineers should be placed in charge of the program. Without disparagement of the splendid record of the Corps of Engineers in their field of responsibility, it can be stated that not one of these reasons is valid. It is notable that there is missing from this list of reasons the primary one which should govern the selection of any Federal agency to perform a particular task, namely, the availability of personnel having the viewpoint, training, experience, background, and technical equipment to handle the problem. These resources for pollution control have been built up by the United States Public Health Service over a period of more than 25 years, during which time, with meager appropriations, they have assembled a highly qualified organization and established an enviable record of useful accomplishment. This work has been quiet, largely intangible, and removed from public view—a reason, perhaps, why the tangible and costly construction projects of the Corps of Engineers should give some people the idea that this agency is vastly superior in its ability to get things done.

As a matter of fact, in all stream investigations in which the Corps of Engineers and the United States Public Health Service have participated jointly the corps has requested the Health Service to handle all phases of the work pertaining to pollution, stream quality, and abatement recommendations. It is presumed that this has been done, because they feel that the Health Service is much better equipped to do the job. In any type of program the Army engineers would continue to handle matters relating to hydrology, maps, channel structures, channel configurations, etc., but it is certain that they would be the last to claim their superior qualifications to deal with the complex problems of pollution. It is apparent that the real reason for the opposition to the United States Public Health Service is the fact that this agency does not subscribe to the extreme views of a few groups interested in only one phase of the problem. Through more than 50 years' fruitful participation with States in regulatory measures for the improvement of the public health and welfare the United States Public Health Service has gained the full faith and confidence of the people of the Nation. It is logical and expedient that it should represent the Federal interests in any pollution-abatement program.

Progress in pollution abatement: Advocates of the plan of rigid federalized control by injunction maintain that the streams of the country are in such appalling condition as to constitute a threat to civilization, and are becoming progressively worse, as a result of the inherent impotency of any State system of regulation and the utter indifference and ineffectiveness of local enforcement agencies. In this connection it is enlightening to look at the record.

According to the report of the Special Committee on Water Pollution, more progress has been made in municipal pollution abatement during the past 6 years than in the preceding quarter of a century. Since 1932 the population tributary to treatment plants has increased from 21,500,000 to 39,760,000, a change from 35 to 54 percent of the sewered population of the country, or an increase from 17 to 31 percent of the Nation's total population. Within this period, and in the face of a rapidly increasing population and tremendous extension of sewer service, the sewered population not served by sewage-treatment plants has been reduced from 40,500,000 to 33,414,000. This has been accomplished at a cost approaching \$1,000,000,000.

In the State of Ohio, for example, during the 12-year period 1928 to 1939, inclusive, 160 municipalities have constructed sewage-treatment improvements costing about \$40,000,000 (exclusive of costs for collecting sewers, interceptors, etc.) serving 3,223,000 people, or nearly 50 percent of the State's population. In the State of New York, between 1933 and 1939, 102 municipal sewage-treatment works have been built at a cost of more than \$38,000,000 and serving 2,854,000 persons. Together with the 161 plants installed in the preceding 30 years, these works now treat the sewage of 263 cities and towns, representing a population of 5,400,000 people, or 78 percent of the entire sewered population of the State. New York City's 10-year program for cleaning up the pollution of that area at a total cost of about \$150,000,000 is proceeding on schedule, and several large plants have been placed in operation. The great abatement program of Chicago is essentially finished, and those of other large centers of population and industry are proceeding apace. Proportionate progress is being made in other regions of the country.

While an important impetus to this recent progress may be attributed to the availability of Federal grants-in-aid, most of the credit should probably go to the behind-scenes educational and promotional activities of public-health agencies which have been relentlessly carried on. And another important reason for progress lies in the realization by municipalities and industries of their moral and legal responsibilities in pollution abatement. While the progress made in the treatment of industrial wastes has not been so outstanding as that in the municipal field, many new plants have been constructed, and the general indifference of industry is noted to be rapidly disappearing.

LXXXVI—140

The Federal-State pattern of cooperation: During a period of about 50 years, there has been developed a plan of action and cooperation between Federal and State authorities on all matters pertaining to the public health that has effected a closely linked relationship and results of most satisfying and significant values. In essence the plan involves the provision by the United States Public Health Service of (a) research services to develop scientific facts and procedures; (b) safe and uniform standards; (c) guidance in methods and procedures, by expert technical assistance; and (d) financial assistance; while the responsibility for legislation and administration of the programs is left with State health agencies. Notable among the achievements in the sanitary field of this working arrangement have been the improvement of drinking water quality, with consequent decrease of the intestinal diseases, through the application of the Treasury standard; the successful attack on the malaria menace of the South through the use of scientific facts, methods, and procedures developed by the Public Health Service; the unprecedented advance in safe milk production through the adoption of the United States Public Health Service standard milk ordinance; and the protection against infected shellfish by the application of standards pertaining to sources, production, and marketing.

In all of these activities and many others the United States Public Health Service has developed the scientific facts and shown the way; the States have accepted guidance and executed programs with enthusiasm and efficiency. There is every reason to believe that this plan is the best one that can be conceived for dealing with the problem of stream-pollution abatement.

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing discussion indicates the author's belief in the following principles relating to the administration of a national program of pollution abatement:

1. That a stream must be recognized as supplying various important needs within the drainage basin, and that all these uses must be considered and balanced.
2. That one of the natural and inescapable uses of streams is for the reception and ultimate disposal of liquid wastes produced on their watersheds after such treatment as may be required.
3. That the self-purification capacities of streams must be utilized to a greater or less degree in all cases, alone or as an adjunct to treatment processes, and that complete treatment of all wastes is neither economically possible nor scientifically necessary.
4. That control of pollution by the injunction process, administered by a Federal agency, is of doubtful constitutionality, contrary to the principles of democratic government, wasteful of money, and ineffective in its prospect of satisfying results.
5. That regulation of pollution is a proper function of State government, and that a Federal agency should operate in an investigative, stimulative, and coordinating capacity, with financial aid furnished for administrative and construction purposes.
6. That the vexatious problems of pollution in interstate waters can best be solved by an extension of the system of interstate compacts and agreements.
7. That the most important factors in pollution abatement are those related to public health, and that health agencies should have the responsibility of administering the program.
8. That the United States Public Health Service is best qualified to represent the interests of the Federal Government, and that the pollution abatement program should be conducted in cooperation with State health agencies along the lines of the "Federal-State pattern" which has been found so effective in other similar undertakings.
9. That with a national campaign conducted under such a plan, and with reasonable availability of Federal funds for loans and grants-in-aid, the future progress in pollution abatement should be comparable with that of the past 6 years. At this rate, within a period of 5 to 10 years the more objectionable conditions of sewage and industrial waste pollution should be corrected.

REFERENCES

1. Third report of the Special Advisory Committee on Water Pollution of the National Resources Committee. House Document No. 155, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.
2. Report of hearings before Committee on Rivers and Harbors of House of Representatives, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, on H. R. 295, H. R. 922, H. R. 2890, H. R. 4170, and H. R. 4314, March 3 and 6, 1939.
3. Report of hearings before Committee on Commerce of United States Senate, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, on S. 1691, March 22, 23, and 27, 1939.
4. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.
5. Tarbett, R. E. National Aspect of Stream Pollution, presented before annual meeting North Carolina Society of Engineers, January 1939 (unpublished).
6. Saville, Thorndike. Administrative Control of Water Pollution. Interim publication of American Institute Chemical Engineers, November 3, 1931.
7. Wolman, Abel. What Can Be Done About Stream Pollution. Proceedings American Society Civil Engineers 64, 1:64 (January), 1938.
8. Wolman, Abel. State and Other Governmental Functions in the Control and Abatement of Water Pollution in the United States, Chapter XXV, Modern Sewage Disposal, Federation of Sewage Works Associations, 1938.

Data condensed from Third Report of Special Advisory Committee on Water Pollution of National Resources Committee, House Document No. 155, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, 1939

I. STATUS OF WATER POLLUTION IN UNITED STATES, 1938

1. Municipal sewage:	
Total population of United States.....	129,818,000
Urban population (incorporated places in excess of 2,500).....	73,200,000
Served by public sewers.....	73,174,000
Percent of total population served by sewers.....	56
Population tributary to primary sewage-treatment plants.....	19,000,000
Population tributary to secondary sewage-treatment plants.....	20,700,000
Total population served by sewage-treatment works.....	
Percent sewerage population served by treatment works.....	54
Percent total population served by treatment works.....	31
Daily discharge of untreated sewage..... gallons.....	2,500,000,000
Daily discharge of treated sewage..... do.....	3,250,000,000
(NOTE.—These statistics cannot give accurate representation of pollution problem. It is not essential that all sewage receive complete treatment and, under certain conditions no treatment may be required. The reasonable self-purification capacities of streams should be utilized.)	
2. Mining and industrial wastes:	
Acid mine drainage from bituminous coal fields, tons H ₂ SO ₄ /year.....	2,700,000
Culm and acid drainage from anthracite coal fields.....	Unknown amount
Brine from oil fields, barrels per day.....	10,000,000
Debris and silt from hydraulic mining operations.....	Unknown amount
Industrial waste from manufacturing processes.....	Unknown amount
(NOTE.—Waste-producing industries account for about 75 percent of manufacturing activity of United States, with an annual value of production of \$18,000,000,000 and with an employment of about 3,000,000 persons.)	

II. ESTIMATED COST OF POLLUTION ABATEMENT

1. Municipal sewage:	
Cost of additional sewage-treatment plants.....	\$1,141,000,000
Annual operating costs of additional treatment plants.....	15,000,000
(NOTE.—These estimates based upon degree of treatment considered necessary and reasonable. If complete treatment were applied, additional capital cost would be about \$2,000,000,000 and annual operating cost about \$30,000,000.)	
2. Mining and industrial wastes:	
Cost of acid control at abandoned bituminous-coal mines.....	\$12,000,000
Cost of corrective treatment at anthracite-coal mines.....	40,000,000
Cost of treatment plants for oil-field brines.....	100,000,000
Cost of industrial waste treatment works.....	900,000,000
Total capital costs.....	1,052,000,000
Annual costs of mining and industrial waste treatment.....	225,000,000
(NOTE.—These estimates do not contemplate complete treatment of all wastes, but assume optimum use of natural purification capacities of streams.)	
3. Recapitulation:	
Capital cost of necessary treatment works.....	\$2,193,000,000
Annual operating and maintenance costs.....	240,000,000

III. PROGRESS IN POLLUTION ABATEMENT IN UNITED STATES

Year	Sewered population	Tributary to treatment works	Population tributary to treatment works	
			Percent of sewerage population	Percent total population
1904.....	28,000,000	1,100,000	3	11.2
1910.....	34,700,000	3,900,000	11	4
1932.....	62,000,000	21,500,000	35	17
1938.....	73,174,000	39,700,000	54	31

¹ Approximately.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of this bill because in my district I have many of the largest paper mills in the world; in fact, I think, the largest—the Kimberly-Clark mills.

These people are very much in favor of this bill, S. 685, with the amendment that may be offered here today, which

will have a tendency to do away with pollution. These manufacturers themselves have cooperated in the past to a large extent in efforts to eliminate stream pollution in what is known as the Fox River Valley. There are perhaps more mills along this river dumping pollution into the river than in any other place in the United States.

I want you to know today that the paper manufacturers of the United States, especially those in my district, would gladly cooperate and support this bill, as they have written me they want me to. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill for two reasons. In the first place, it sets up another commission in the Government of the United States that will cost several hundred thousand dollars per annum. In the second place, as was stated on the floor of the House today by those who favor this bill, the pollution question is being solved at the present time by the States.

I am a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and I have listened to every word of testimony that was given before that committee in reference to this problem. The testimony is to the effect that about 80 percent of the pollution problem has already been solved by the States, and each year they are working on it. Therefore this legislation is unnecessary.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I understand that the gentleman is opposed to this legislation because it goes too far.

Mr. CARTER. I stated the two reasons I oppose this legislation.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he would not be in favor of any legislation on the subject.

Mr. CARTER. I believe the States are cleaning up the pollution problem and they should continue to clean it up. The gentleman from Mississippi is a very ardent advocate of State rights, and I do not want to send the Surgeon General of the United States down into the State of Mississippi or any other State to tell the people there what to do about their pollution problems. You have enough brains and ability in your own State to clean up this problem, and it is being done, and will continue to be done, throughout the United States.

Mr. SEGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SEGER. May I say that the State of New Jersey has spent \$20,000,000 of its own money in cleaning up a river, and this money was spent without asking aid of the United States Government.

Mr. CARTER. I congratulate the State of New Jersey. In my own community we have a sewage-disposal problem that it is estimated will cost \$15,000,000 to solve. I am sure if we could get this money out of the Federal Treasury my community would come running here in order to do that, but I am telling them to solve their own problem. There is no money in the Federal Treasury at the present time, and the only money we get in, little as it is, comes from the various States and municipalities. So they might as well finance their own problems.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. On the same basis the gentleman would advocate the abolition of the Bureau of Entomology, for which we appropriate \$5,000,000 a year, and he would also advocate doing away with the appropriation for the control of the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. CARTER. One question at a time. I am using all of my ability to prevent you money spenders from establishing new commissions. I will enlist in any crusade with the gentleman from Ohio or others to eliminate a number of things that are not essential and necessary.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. In a few minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. I am well aware of that. I can remember as far back, may I say to the gentleman, as yesterday without his assistance. I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, we are in an unusual position here today. Technically we have before us the Senate bill 685, but the hope has been expressed by some that a substitute will be accepted in place of that bill. The substitute is an amendment that comes from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It is pretty much the same, although different in some particulars. In an endeavor to cut down the amount of overhead involved in this bill the Rivers and Harbors Committee set the sum at \$250,000 per annum for the overhead expenses; but, Mr. Chairman, may I say that so far as the financial outlay is concerned, there is a joker in this bill, and I refer to paragraph (c), section 7, of the Rivers and Harbors print. In addition to the \$250,000 that ostensibly is set up as the annual overhead, there is a provision in there which reads as follows:

The personnel of the Public Health Service paid from any appropriation not made pursuant to section 7—

That is a section of this act—

may be detailed to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

That leaves it entirely up to the Surgeon General as to the number of personnel that will be transferred, and no one can stand up here and tell me what it is going to cost per annum to administer this act.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. May I ask the gentleman, whose memory is so good, does he know that these great rivers of the United States flow interstate? How is he going to get jurisdiction of them if they do flow interstate?

Mr. CARTER. I will be happy to answer that question. May I say first that we have rivers in the West that flow interstate. We have developed one of those rivers, the Colorado, and we did this through interstate compacts.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman means the Government developed it.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further. I desire to answer the gentleman's question.

I will vote here to permit these States to enter into compacts, if such legislation is necessary, and where there is an interstate river involved, if they desire to work it out on an interstate basis. I will permit them to do that.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further. I think the example of the Colorado River compact is a splendid example for these other States and should be followed.

There is no necessity for establishing another bureau in the Government. While the annual overhead is set at \$250,000 and upward for the first year, you gentlemen well know the history of bureaus and commissions. Let the camel get his nose under the tent, and it will rise up to a million dollars very soon.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the efficient and distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to my gracious colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is a little joker further down in the bill—did the gentleman find it?—whereby the new division can call upon individuals from other departments to be assigned to duty in this work, and such persons must be paid from the appropriation of the department or agency from which they are assigned. Therefore the \$250,000 is a mere trifle when considering the large number of engineers and scientists that will be assigned to work out this problem paid from other appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is very apt at this time.

The President of the United States in an economy message delivered here a few months ago stated that the way to stop appropriations is to stop authorizations, and you

Members of this House know that is the way to do it. If we do not stop these authorizations we are never going to be able to stop the appropriations. Therefore I am urging that this bill be defeated today.

I am for cleaning up the streams of the State and navigable waters and the inland bays and rivers just as much as anyone, but I maintain and contend, and I challenge anybody to prove otherwise, that this work is being done now by the States. Therefore, why set up another organization? If the Federal Government is going to do this at all, why not do it under the Chief of Engineers, who has a river and harbor organization at the present time covering the entire United States?

Mr. SANDAGER and Mr. BENDER rose.

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. SANDAGER. I wish the gentleman from California would explain before he leaves the floor wherein the substitute differs from the original bill.

Mr. CARTER. The substitute differs in this respect: The original Senate bill provides for an overhead of \$1,000,000 a year, with a limit of \$50,000,000 for grants and lending purposes per annum.

Mr. COCHRAN. And awards or grants which mean gifts.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; for grants and loans. This bill provides ostensibly, on the face of it, \$250,000 for overhead, but, as the distinguished and able gentleman from Missouri has suggested, it also leaves a loophole open whereby they can call in all kinds of personnel from the outside who will not be paid out of this appropriation of \$250,000 per annum. Now, I ask, how much is this bill going to cost per annum? There is not a person in this House who can answer that question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I notice in the bill that this new set-up will be required to make tests of bathing beaches from time to time. Can the gentleman tell us how many bathing beaches there are in the United States? It would be interesting to know the burden on the division of this work alone.

Mr. CARTER. No; and that is another reason for voting against this measure.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield further.

This division of water pollution is to be set up in the Public Health Service and is to be under the control of a director. The director is not appointed in the usual way by the President but, under the terms of this bill, is appointed by the Surgeon General, who has very extensive powers when it comes to administering this bill. From the study I have made of the bill, I believe their hope and their ambition is to set up another organization duplicating that of the Chief of Engineers throughout the country. They provide that this division of water pollution shall make its reports to the Commerce Committee of the Senate and to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, as is done in river and harbor work.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, this bill calls for an expenditure of not more than \$250,000 a year by the Federal Government. It provides that various political subdivisions and States may borrow money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at a low rate of interest to prevent stream pollution. As I pointed out yesterday, we spend millions of dollars in order to exterminate various insects which infest the agricultural areas of the country. Insects recognize no State lines and neither does water pollution. This is the only satisfactory way in which this problem can be solved.

Our hearts bleed for Finland, and our hearts bleed for Czechoslovakia and Poland. We appropriate millions of dollars to be loaned through the Export-Import Bank for the

benefit of these unfortunate people. But charity begins at home. Here is our chance to help our own people. Because of stream pollution thousands of lives are being affected and hundreds of lives are being snuffed out by reason of diseases resulting from pollution.

It is true that States and communities are doing much to solve this problem but there are many communities which have no funds. They would like to help out in this situation but they do not have the money. Let us give them the opportunity of borrowing this money from the Federal Government in the regular way. There are no grants in this bill. Nothing is given to them. The bill provides \$250,000 to be used by the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General's Department has never been questioned on the floor of this House. A member of the staff of the Army engineers is to serve as a member of this commission and he will join hands with the Surgeon General in administering the law. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, once more we have before us a so-called anti-stream-pollution bill. Those of us who have been interested in legislation of this kind for a great many years have been very hopeful, after the many years of work and labor which have gone toward a solution of this problem, that some day we would have before us a piece of legislation that we could get behind wholeheartedly and enthusiastically and support, because we believe that it may accomplish something to correct this evil which is one of our national disgraces. We have hoped we could have upon our books a piece of legislation that would be something more than a sop thrown to the people to make them believe that steps were really being taken to eradicate stream pollution in the United States, but here we have a bill very much like the other bills with which we have been confronted—a bill which gives unlimited bureaucratic possibilities; a bill which makes possible large appropriations from time to time to tell the American people exactly what we already know, and that is what is polluting our streams. Everyone in the United States knows what is polluting the streams. They know that stream pollution is coming from industrial and domestic wastes. They know that if stream pollution is to be prevented, the waste coming from the large industries and the sewage coming from the large metropolitan centers must be purified before it is allowed to go into the streams.

What we need is legislation which will clamp down on the influences which are polluting our streams and then prevent them, after a reasonable length of time, from allowing it to go into the streams. This legislation will not accomplish that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons we have never been able to accomplish anything definite in regard to the solution of this problem of stream pollution is the fact that those of us who are genuinely for legislation which will accomplish our purpose are usually kept divided by the efforts of those who pretend to be lobbying in favor of anti-stream-pollution legislation. It is quite plain to be seen there is many a lobbyist operating here in Washington who does not wish to accomplish the purpose for which he is lobbying. Whenever a lobbyist has a great issue and has behind him organizations that are financing him in his efforts, he is, of course, quite well aware that if he succeeds in having his issue enacted into law his position as a highly paid lobbyist is going to disappear. Unfortunately, because of the efforts of some of these lobbyists, those of us who are against legislation like S. 685 have been kept divided in order that we may not concentrate our efforts toward the enactment of a piece of legislation which will solve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this legislation will be defeated. I do not want a piece of legislation passed which will be heralded to the sportsmen of the United States as a panacea for the injustices they have had heaped upon them by the metropolitan centers and the industrial interests of the United

States when, in reality, it does nothing whatever to solve the problem or to purify our streams and make them better centers for fishing, bathing, boating, and the water in them more healthful and palatable. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know on what conservation meat the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who preceded me, feeds. We have been confronted with the extreme attitude—you might say, the uncompromising attitude—of those who are interested in the conservation of game. All of them have acquiesced in this bill provided the Mundt amendment is added, and we have agreed to that.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Just briefly; yes.

Mr. FADDIS. I simply want to say that I believe some of the interests who really do not want a bill passed have agitated the extreme views.

Mr. CULKIN. That is a statement, but the gentleman, obviously, does not want any bill at all, or he is blind to the progress of conciliation that has gone on here. Everybody is for this bill now, except the ardent and confirmed polluters who are threatening the life of the people of the United States.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. SEGER. I believe the gentleman is doing many of us here an injustice. I am not a polluter, but I am against the bill.

Mr. CULKIN. I was talking in terms of the public. I now want to say a word about the distinguished gentleman from California, for whom I have great affection. We are spending, for California and in California, approximately \$400,000,000 to give them a good water supply. We are spending \$150,000,000 on Boulder Dam, and we are spending \$190,000,000 on Central Valley. This is to turn the ocean back, and turn salt water into fresh. Now, why in God's name, is the gentleman for that, and wholeheartedly for that, working ably in that cause, and yet resists the attempt of the people of the United States to cure this great problem of interstate pollution. The gentleman from California spoke about the engineers. The engineers are in fact, in this bill, but the engineers have no chemists, they have no groups that would analyze the bacterial content of these waters, and that is one reason why we put it in the Public Health Service.

Congress has worked on this problem for 20 years. This measure provides a progressive solution which will help a very difficult national situation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS].

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the House agrees with me today in extending our heartfelt wishes for the recovery of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is in the Naval Hospital at the present time. Word has just reached the Chamber that he is to undergo an operation today, and we are all fervently praying that he will immediately recover and be back with us. If he were here he would be wholeheartedly supporting this measure, as he has so faithfully worked in the committee to get a bill reported that would fit the needs of the country and obtain the support of the membership of this House.

Mr. Chairman, this country is a country of propaganda. We talk about propaganda from across the seas in time of war, but I think we have more propaganda in America than in any other nation on the face of the globe, and the more the propaganda is spread for a common cause, sometimes the less we obtain results in the direction in which we are propagandizing. Recently, at least in the last 4 or 5 years, there has been a great wave of sentiment around the country to clean up the streams and harbors, and the more we talk about it the further some Members get away from it. Three groups are

interested in this thing today. One is a small group, thank God, of the polluters who want to keep on polluting the streams. They are against anything that will clean up the situation. There is another group, not considering what has been done during the last 6 or 7 years, who would want to clean it up the day after tomorrow and have all the streams pure, with all of the fish swimming again. Then there is the larger group, I think, who believe in enacting legislation and attacking this problem in a sensible, logical way, whereby we will not have to destroy industry and the credit of the municipalities and the States of this country, but will eventually clean up the situation. I think it is the larger group that will support this measure today.

I was very much amused at the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]. Two years ago he was against this measure because it provided \$50,000,000 annually in grants and loans, but he never said anything about the \$190,000,000 that the Government has been granting and lending to clean up the water supply of the State of California. He now comes in and complains, since we have eliminated that from the bill and reduced the administrative expense to \$250,000 a year, that he is still against the bill because of administrative expenses.

Mr. CARTER rose.

Mr. PARSONS. I cannot yield; I have only a few minutes. The gentleman knows that if there was no added administrative expense for this Board in the Public Health Service that Service would have to neglect some of its other duties. I was responsible, perhaps as much as or more than any other member of the committee, in having the Chief of Engineers or some member designated by him to be a member of this Board, because the Army engineers have had jurisdiction of the rivers under the War Department for many, many years, and naturally, of course, they should be represented on this Board.

Let us see what has been done. In the 140 years prior to 1930 we had cleaned up the streams that had been polluted about 25 percent. In the last 7 years—and these figures are a matter of record—we have cleaned up pollution of the streams of this country at a rate which includes more than 18,200,000 population, which is, when we consider the pollution that comes from the cities, approximately 33 1/3 percent. We have been making great progress in these last 6 or 7 years with the aid and assistance of loans and grants from the Federal Government. Prior to 1930 there had been about 3,900 plants erected by the cities and municipalities for the disposal of their sewage. In the last 6 years there has been erected 1,310 additional—more than 33 1/3 percent in 6 years—over 140 years prior to that time. So I say that we are attempting in a big way to take care of the situation.

In answer to those who were followers of the original Mundt bill, where they wanted a drastic measure adopted, where they could enjoin municipalities and private industry to immediately forthwith desist from polluting the streams, or to those who wanted a set definite limitation as to when those streams should be cleared, I say that we cannot afford to interfere with industry in such a drastic manner. We cannot afford to intimidate them and increase unemployment, and cannot afford to enjoin municipalities immediately whose credit is impaired somewhat at the present time. Therefore, after we have cleaned the situation 50 percent in the last 7 years to a point where industry has been cooperating in every case, and that without any legislation, but purely on a cooperative basis, I say to you who have been supporters of the Mundt bill that the amendment we have proposed to accept will gradually and surely eventually attain the result that even the most fiery solicitor for clean streams has ever wished for.

Now, it is estimated that it will take approximately \$1,000,000,000 in the next 10 or 12 years for industry to clean pollution from the streams in the industrial areas. It will probably take another billion dollars in the next 7 or 8 years to effectuate for the municipalities the work that we hope to attain. We cannot do that all in a day or in a year. It takes a year or two to draw plans. It takes another year or two to get the contracts and the funds provided for, and then another year for the completion of them. The Public Health

Service has said to us in committee that in the next 10 years, with the same progress that has been made in the past 7 years, we will practically have completed the program.

Now, as to new sources of stream pollution which the Mundt amendment covers, which has been accepted by the committee, it provides that no new source of pollution shall be poured into the streams or the tributaries unless approved by the Public Health Division. That means that if a new industry or a new city is established, they must come to the Board for approval before they can pollute the streams. Then if there are any individuals or if there are any municipalities who fail to comply, they can go into the district court in that area and obtain an injunction prohibiting them from polluting the stream. That is to take care of the situation so far as any of those who want this evil corrected now are concerned.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Do I get the idea that if it were clear to this board, they would permit pollution to enter into the streams?

Mr. PARSONS. Not at all; but they have a right to survey and investigate to ascertain whether or not the stream is being polluted, and we will not just have the say-so of some fellow who wants to crack down on industry at his own will, for political purposes or otherwise. That is why this protection is written into the Mundt amendment.

So I say that when the amendment is proposed by the committee, it should be adopted, and the amendment to the amendment which will be proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] should also be adopted, and that the bill be passed. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. This Mundt amendment which is to be offered, as I understand, is that which is printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 1097.

Mr. PARSONS. Of yesterday or the day before?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Of yesterday's RECORD.

Mr. PARSONS. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. As I read it, if somebody wishes to start a reduction plant or a mill for the concentration of ore away up in the mountains of Colorado on a stream which is a tributary of the South Platte, which in turn is a tributary of the Missouri, which in turn is a tributary of the Mississippi, then he must get the permission of this Federal board before he can start operations, because, technically speaking, the discharging of a small amount of tailings into that stream would be pollution?

Mr. PARSONS. That is correct. If we ever intend to clean up this situation, there must be a beginning, and we thought it better to begin with new sources of stream pollution, because they could come under it as they develop, so that there would be no further expense to them in the operation of their business in the future.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. If I correctly interpret public sentiment in our State, the people of Colorado are more interested in encouraging private industry to give employment, in getting people back to work, than they are in having Congress enact any more of this so-called corrective or reform legislation. Every one of these bills puts more men on the public pay roll. Many of these bills discourage private investors in any plans to put more men to work on private industry's pay rolls.

Mr. PARSONS. Anticipating what the gentleman's next question will be, I will say to the gentleman that the Public Health Service has had such wonderful cooperation that they really did not want this language in the bill. They would rather proceed on a cooperative basis, because they have only had three or four cases in the entire United States where they have been turned down. But there are a number of Members here who believe that something should be put into the bill that the Public Health Service could enforce on new sources of stream pollution, if necessary.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not a fact that the type of disturbance in a stream such as the gentleman speaks of is not in fact such pollution as comes within the scope of this bill?

Mr. PARSONS. As far as what the gentleman stated, it certainly would not come within the scope of this bill; but if it did, I am sure that the gentleman's State has a much stronger law against stream pollution than this bill itself carries.

Mr. CULKIN. The fact is that the great bulk of the stuff that comes from manufactures into streams is not, of its own nature, hostile to life or harmful to human beings. It does not come within the category.

Mr. PARSONS. Well, it would not come under this act at all unless it was shown that it was a source of pollution that created a nuisance to public life and marine life.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Nevertheless, an action can be brought in a Federal court there, and this man who wants to put a few or many men to work can be brought into the Federal court and compelled, at great expense, to go into the intricacies of how much pollution these few mill tailings would involve.

Mr. PARSONS. Not at all, unless it was a source of pollution. Tailings from a mine would not necessarily be a new source of stream pollution. It might be. Water coming from the mine might be.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The burden would be put upon the man who is planning to give others work to show in a Federal court that his proposed industry would not pollute the stream, unless he had been able to win in advance the approval of a Federal agency, probably wholly ignorant of such industry.

Mr. PARSONS. That is correct, but does the gentleman want to stop pollution in the future?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I certainly do.

Mr. PARSONS. If he does, then he should start now. If not, then he should not be for any bill at all.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I think we are handling that very well in our own State, as the gentleman stated in the beginning of his address. The people in our part of the country are getting very tired—they are, indeed, being rubbed raw—by Federal agencies and their agents and employees sent out there from Washington, some of whom have never before been west of the Alleghenies, who are wholly ignorant of our local conditions and who, under authority of Federal statutes, are trying to tell the people of Colorado how to run their State.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman knows that his State has a stronger law on pollution than this amendment carries here.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It might not be so regarded by this new Federal agency.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I should like to have the RECORD show just what Congress means by the phrase "new pollution." In the great district which I have the honor to represent—however humbly—we have a great many canning factories. Their work is seasonal. Each year in the fall they pollute the water. Would this be new pollution since it happens only occasionally? Would that be considered old pollution? I wish the RECORD to show what the understanding of the committee is in order that the courts may so interpret the law when it is enacted.

Mr. PARSONS. I am very happy the gentlewoman has asked that question; and I may say that the gentlewoman represents here in the House the district represented by the man who served the longest number of years in the Congress of the United States, the late Joseph G. Cannon. Answering the gentlewoman's inquiry I may say that plants already in operation and which are now sources of pollution at certain seasons of the year would not be considered as new sources of pollution under the terms of the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I have had a great deal of correspondence from wildlife preservationists, game protective associations, and like organizations in regard to this bill.

Mr. PARSONS. I have had a great deal myself.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. But in keeping with the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado let me say that the mining industry is very much concerned about this bill. I hope that the terms of the bill will be so defined as to prevent harm coming to, or unnecessary regulation of, the small mine operators such as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned. Unnecessary regulation must be avoided, even in this vital matter.

Mr. PARSONS. I think I can safely say to the gentleman that with the Public Health Service and the Chief of Engineers on this board he has nothing to fear that industry will be disturbed under the provision against new sources of pollution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Would the gentleman consider the enlargement of a present industry a source of new pollution, or an increase of the flow of pollutive substances from an established industry a source of new pollution?

Mr. PARSONS. This question has been raised by a number of Members. Answering the gentleman I would say that would not be a new source of pollution, because the present source of pollution is there. An extension or an expansion of a present business would not, under the terms of this act, be considered a new source of stream pollution. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Public Health Service a Division of Water Pollution Control (hereinafter referred to as the Division). The Division shall be in charge of a Director, who shall be a commissioned engineer officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed for such duty by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the Surgeon General). Such engineer officer, while serving as Director, shall have the rank of an Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, subject to the provisions of law applicable to Assistant Surgeons General in charge of administrative divisions in the District of Columbia of the Public Health Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. GAVAGAN: In S. 685, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby established in the United States Public Health Service a Division of Water Pollution Control (hereinafter referred to as the Division). The Division shall be in charge of a Director, who shall be a commissioned engineer officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed for such duty by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the Surgeon General). Such engineer officer, while serving as Director, shall have the rank of an Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, subject to the provisions of law applicable to Assistant Surgeons General in charge of administrative divisions in the District of Columbia of the Public Health Service.

"Sec. 2. (a) The Division shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, other Federal agencies, and the agencies of the several States authorized by law or duly designated to deal with water pollution, and in cooperation with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare comprehensive plans for eliminating or reducing the pollution and improving the sanitary condition of the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto. In the development of such comprehensive plans, due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters and promote their use for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life, recreational purposes, agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses, and for this purpose the Division is authorized to make joint investigations with the aforesaid agencies of the Federal Government and any State or States of the condition of any waters of the United States, either navigable or otherwise, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may deleteriously affect such waters.

"(b) The Division shall encourage cooperative activities by the several States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to water pollution; encourage compacts between the several States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; collect and disseminate information; make available to State agencies, municipalities, industries, and individuals the results of such surveys,

studies, investigations, and experiments conducted by the Division and by other agencies, public and private; and furnish such assistance to State agencies as may be authorized by law.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and abatement of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and to establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Division, upon request of any State health authority and subject to the approval of the Surgeon General, shall conduct investigations and make surveys of any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, drainage-basin authority, community, or municipality with a view to effecting a solution of such problem, and shall make definite recommendations for the correction and elimination of the deleterious conditions found to exist.

"(b) The Division, upon the request of any municipality, shall make a periodic test of the water at any bathing beach within the limits of such municipality, and shall make a report to such municipality as promptly as possible with respect to the existence of water pollution at such bathing beach and shall make definite recommendations for the correction and elimination of any deleterious conditions which are found to exist: *Provided*, That only such sums as may be specifically appropriated for such purposes shall be expended in making such tests and recommendations.

"Sec. 4. The Public Health Service shall prepare and publish, from time to time, reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, and experiments as shall be made under the authority of this act, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of pollution of the waters of the United States.

"Sec. 5. Every loan or purchase of securities by Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance the construction of treatment works shall hereafter be made only upon the recommendation of the State health authority having jurisdiction and upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General and his certification that such construction is necessary to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste which would substantially impair the quality of any waters of the United States.

"Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Division, by detail from time to time, a board of five, four of whom shall be commissioned engineer officers of the Public Health Service, a majority of whom shall be experienced in sanitary engineering, and the fifth, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, or a member of the Corps of Engineers designated by him, all said members to serve without additional compensation. The duties of said board shall be fixed by the Surgeon General, and to it shall be referred for consideration and recommendations, in addition to any other duties assigned, so far as in the opinion of the Surgeon General may be necessary, all reports of examinations, investigations, plans, studies, and surveys made pursuant to the provisions of this act or hereafter provided for by the Congress, and all applications for loans for the construction of necessary treatment works proposed to be made pursuant to section 5 of this act, and all other matters in connection therewith upon which report is desired by the Surgeon General. The board shall submit to the Surgeon General recommendations as to the desirability of commencing, continuing, or extending any and all projects for treatment works upon which reports are desired and for which loan applications have been made. In the consideration of such proposed treatment works and projects the board shall have in view the benefits to be derived by the construction thereof in accomplishing the purpose of this act, and the relation of the ultimate cost of such works, both as to the cost of construction and maintenance, to the public interests involved, the public necessity for such works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or agreed upon by the applicant for the loan for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof. The board shall, when it considers the same necessary, and with the approval and under orders from the Surgeon General, make as a board or through its members, personal examinations of localities where the proposed treatment works are to be located. All plans, cost estimates, information, and arguments which are presented to the board for its consideration in connection with any matter referred to it by the Surgeon General shall be reduced to and submitted in writing, and shall be made a part of the records of the office of the Surgeon General.

"(b) As soon as practicable the board shall classify the navigable waters of the continental United States into districts to be known as sanitary water districts. The board shall fix and define the boundaries of each such district and may from time to time alter such boundaries. The areas of such districts shall, insofar as practicable, conform to the areas of watersheds not wholly contained within the boundaries of one State.

"(c) All special reports ordered by the Congress pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, at the discretion of the Surgeon General, be reviewed in like manner by the said board; and the said board shall also, on request by resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate or the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives submitted to the Surgeon General, examine and review the report of any examination, investigation, survey, or project for the elimination or reduction of water pollution or for the construction of treatment works made pursuant to any act or resolution of the Congress, and shall report through the Surgeon General, who shall submit its conclusions thereon through

the Federal Security Administrator and the President as in other cases.

"Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the sum of \$250,000 for all necessary expenses of the Division in administering the provisions of this act, including (a) expenses of investigations made under this act, including (1) printing and binding of the findings of such investigations; (2) the pay and allowances, travel expenses of personnel of the Public Health Service (including commissioned officers) while engaged in field investigation; (3) (upon the approval of the Surgeon General) the expenses of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of the personal effects of such personnel and personnel of other Government departments on duty with the Public Health Service upon permanent change of station under competent orders in connection therewith while engaged in such investigations; and (4) purchases required for such investigations, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5), when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100; (b) upon approval of the Surgeon General, the necessary expenses of the board of engineer officers provided for in section 6 (a) of this act; (c) the pay and allowances and travel expenses of Reserve engineer officers while on active duty under section 8 (a) of this act; and (d) for the reimbursement of appropriations insofar as expended for pay and allowances of personnel detailed to the Division under section 8 (c) or 8 (d) of this act.

"Sec. 8. (a) For the administration of this act, the Federal Security Administrator may, upon recommendation of the Surgeon General, appoint such engineers, attorneys, experts, research assistants, examiners, and consultants as may be necessary, and fix their compensation, in the manner provided by law for the appointment and fixing of compensation of personnel of the Public Health Service; and the Surgeon General is authorized to transfer, assign, or detail to the Division, from any other division of the Public Health Service, such professional and scientific personnel as may be available. Not exceeding 10 engineer officers in the Reserve of the Public Health Service may be ordered to active duty for such periods of time as may be desirable, extending not more than 5 years beyond the date of enactment of this act, to assist in carrying out the purpose thereof.

"(b) Such clerks, stenographers, and other employees as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Division and for the investigations in the field shall be appointed by the Federal Security Administrator in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and he shall prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to their duties as he may find necessary.

"(c) The personnel of the Public Health Service paid from any appropriation not made pursuant to section 7 may be detailed to assist in carrying out the purpose of this act.

"(d) The Federal Security Administrator, with the consent of the head of any other executive department of the Federal Government, may utilize such officers and employees of said department as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 9. When used in this act, the term 'State health authority' means the official State health department, State board of health, or such other official State or interstate agency as is empowered with the duties of enforcing State laws pertaining to public health or to the abatement of pollution of waters; the term 'treatment works' means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial waste of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping and power equipment and their appurtenances; the term 'person' means an individual in the capacity of proprietor of an industrial enterprise, a partnership, a private corporation, an association, a joint-stock company, a trust, or an estate.

"Sec. 10. No provision of this act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the functions, under any other act, of the Public Health Service relating to the prevention, control, and investigation of sewage and pollution either directly or indirectly of the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto.

"Sec. 11. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 12. All provisions of this act applicable to the States shall also be applicable to the District of Columbia and the Territories, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

"Sec. 13. This act may be cited as the 'Water Pollution Act.'"

Mr. GAVAGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment may be dispensed with as it was printed in the RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask if this amendment now submitted to the House includes the so-called Mundt amendment?

Mr. GAVAGAN. No; it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVAGAN. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Is the amendment the gentleman is now offering included in the print of the bill headed "Confidential Committee Print"?

Mr. GAVAGAN. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLER. Is the bill to be read by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent the bill has been considered as read, it now being in the form of a committee amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. As I understand the situation, the bill as read is one amendment which is pending before the Committee, and that now amendments may be offered to any portion of that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. BLAND. That an amendment may be offered, but an amendment to an amendment could not be offered because it would be an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the only difference between the amendment as now offered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the bill as it passed the Senate is that sections 5 and 6 of the Senate bill are stricken out. These sections provided for Federal aid to States and for Federal grants and loans to persons, individuals, and corporations. A further change is made that instead of the lending authority being the Secretary of the Treasury it has been changed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Otherwise, with a few changes in prepositions throughout the bill, there has been no other change from Senate bill 685.

Mr. KELLER. May I ask what is the idea of striking out the Senate provision, which seemed to me to be a very good one, having to do with granting aids to cities and States? There are many cities in the United States at the present time that are entirely unable economically to undertake this very thing of doing away with stream pollution.

Mr. GAVAGAN. The reason for it is the state of the Treasury of the United States and the exorbitant cost that would be involved in rectifying the situation through Government grants-in-aid or loans. The loans will have to be justified before the R. F. C. They will have to be able to show that the work is not only necessary but that there will be a chance for the Government to get back its money.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. The fact is that the President vetoed the original bill passed 2 years ago because it did not conform to budgetary requirements. We have been trying to correct that situation.

Mr. KELLER. Which means what?

Mr. PARSONS. That means he does not want any more outright grants given to municipalities.

Mr. KELLER. What are you going to do in the case of a town that is practically bankrupt?

Mr. PARSONS. The attorney for the R. F. C. stated before the committee that where municipalities or private business could not obtain local bank loans for this purpose, they could come to the R. F. C., make application there, and get relief under the terms of this act.

Mr. KELLER. Do I understand that goes far enough to meet a condition like this: There is a city of considerable thousands of people in my district which is in default at the present time on its water and sewage bonds. Those sewage bonds did not provide for sewage disposal at all. I do not know how they could go about it. You will find 50 or 100 situations in the United States that ought to be attended to, and the people desire not to pollute the

streams, but they will be prevented from carrying out the idea expressed in this act unless they have assistance.

Mr. PARSONS. Of course, we cannot legislate for each particular case in a measure of this kind. The loan feature is in here in order to give them that opportunity.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SEGER. I think we would be interested in this dialogue if we could hear more of it.

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I think the reason that grants were taken out of the bill was because of a suggestion made by the President, who said this would further unbalance the Budget. He disapproved of the grants and vetoed the other bill. We certainly do not want to pass a bill that will be vetoed again. He expressly said he did not want grants in the bill because it would be a direct obligation against the Government.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the so-called Rivers and Harbors Committee amendment is now pending before the House as an amendment to the original bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and it is subject to amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER to the Committee substitute amendment: Page 9, line 15, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman tell us the language that is stricken?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the part which will be stricken by my amendment reads as follows:

The personnel of the Public Health Service paid from any appropriation not made pursuant to section 7 may be detailed to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN], which is really a substitute for the original Senate bill, has never been referred to the Bureau of the Budget. So far as I know it has never been referred to anybody. So far as I know, and I am a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, no witness was ever called before that committee to testify in reference to this bill.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Not at this point. No hearings were ever held. I was unable to attend all of the meetings, but I understand there was some discussion among the committee membership about the bill at the time of reporting it; but other than that, so far as I know, there was not one witness called.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman knows there was a conference held at the other end of the Avenue, attended by all parties interested and all of the Government agencies interested or named in this bill, and all agencies that will have anything to do with the functioning or the administration of it. This was all thrashed out, and this appropriation of \$250,000 was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman flatters me. This is the first time I ever heard of that conference. I never knew of such a conference; and if there were any Republicans present, I was not one of them. I knew absolutely nothing about the meeting.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman missed three meetings of the Rivers and Harbors Committee at which this amendment was discussed rather at length.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, I have no doubt but that the committee discussed it. What I am saying is that no hearings were ever held on this bill.

Mr. CULKIN. We heard the R. F. C. attorneys on it, and we heard Dr. Parran on it in detail.

Mr. CARTER. Did the gentleman from New York attend the meeting at the other end of the Avenue referred to by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CULKIN. I did not.

Mr. CARTER. Was the gentleman aware of the meeting?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes; I knew about the meeting.

Mr. CARTER. Well, the gentleman had more information than I.

Mr. CULKIN. Why was not the gentleman present at the three meetings of the Rivers and Harbors Committee when this amendment was brought up? Was he busy otherwise? I assume he was.

Mr. CARTER. I am not answerable to the gentleman from New York for my actions. I believe upon reflection the gentleman from New York will want to withdraw that question. I am answerable to my constituents and to my conscience as to my presence. I decline to yield further.

If the gentleman wants to proceed in an unparliamentary manner that is his business.

Mr. CULKIN. I am complimenting the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield further, but I want to say that I most thoroughly resent the question of the gentleman from New York. I feel amply able to determine where I shall be at any particular time without any suggestions from him.

The amendment I have offered strikes from the bill that section which would permit the Surgeon General to call into this work any number of employees from other parts of the Public Health Service not paid out of the \$250,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. It is the only way we are going to know what this overhead will amount to. As it is at the present time, I understand they have technical experts there whom they pay \$50 a day. There is no limit to the number of those experts that might be called in. They are not paid out of this appropriation of \$250,000.

Let me say that it would be a most reckless act on the part of this Committee to delegate to the Surgeon General this authority. As I called to the attention of the Committee a few minutes ago, the President of the United States does not appoint this director, it is the Surgeon General who appoints the director of this division, and he is responsible to the Surgeon General alone.

I do not want to be misunderstood in reference to this matter. I am opposed to this bill and I am opposed to the substitute that was offered by the gentleman from New York. I want to say, however, that my amendment does make that substitute a much better bill than it is at the present time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry our colleagues in the committee have gotten into a personal and acrimonious discussion. Much as I admire the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and he is an esteemed and good friend of many years, I cannot really believe he is sincere in his amendment to strike out subdivision (c) of subdivision (a) of this paragraph. The paragraph, as written by the committee, simply gives the Surgeon General the right to transfer employees already upon his pay roll from one division or another to this new division. There is nothing strange about that procedure. We have been doing it from time immemorial.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the amendment will not be agreed to. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT to the committee substitute to S. 685: Immediately after subsection "c" of section 2 of the committee amendment, add the following subsection:

"(d) (1) After date of enactment of this act, no new sources of pollution, either by sewage or industrial waste, shall be permitted to be discharged into the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto until and unless approved by the Division; and

"(2) The discharge of new sources of water pollution without review and approval of the Division as required under the foregoing provisions is hereby declared to be against the public policy of the United States and to be a public and common nuisance. An action to prevent or abate any such nuisance may be brought in the name of the United States by any United States attorney, and it shall be the duty of such attorney to bring such an action when requested to do so by the Division, the Surgeon General, any duly constituted interstate agency dealing with control of water pollution, any State agency dealing with control of water pollution, any State health authority, or any incorporated municipality. Such action shall be brought as an action in equity and may be brought in any court of the United States having jurisdiction to hear and determine equity cases."

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is opposed by members of this committee, and I ask to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I have discussed this amendment and it has been discussed by members of the committee and by different conservationists on the floor for the last 2 days. I do not believe it is necessary to go into detail as to what it does. Substantially, it simply states that if Congress is ready—and I am sure it is—to do something about pollution, to go along with S. 685 and appropriate a small amount of money to help encourage surveys and studies of the pollution problem, to make available to municipalities and to industries at low interest rates money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to establish pollution-control works, to declare that pollution is not in accord with the better public policy of America, and still withal to assume a reasonable attitude that we are not going to clamp down this year or next year and stop polluters from continuing a practice in which they have for many years been engaged, my amendment follows almost axiomatically as an important and integral part of that philosophy.

Surely before we begin the appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury to attack the problem of pollution we must do something to stop new forms of deleterious pollution injurious to human life and detrimental to animal and fish life, and that is all my amendment does.

The question confronting us, then, is that with S. 685 and this amendment added to it, the conservationists of the country are united in saying that we are making some progress toward pollution regulation and elimination. Without my amendment and with no pollution-discouraging legislation it resolves itself into whether or not we are going to bring before this country some day a dwarfed and distorted version of the great Abraham Lincoln, raised on the shores of some flowing sewer, who will say: "Let us make this Government a government of the polluters, by the polluters, and for the polluters."

The issue is clear-cut. The committee has indicated its acceptance of my amendment—at least those members of the committee who are supporting S. 685 have done so—and I hope it will have the approval of this body. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for years I have been following this legislation and have seen it inevitably wrecked upon this rock.

Let me read this amendment and then let us see whether the men here will vote for it or not:

(d) (1) After date of enactment of this act, no new sources of pollution—

If a man residing in a town wants to build his own garage that happens to dump waste into the sewer that goes into navigable water, without any previous permission for that event, he is in danger of Federal prosecution.

No new sources of pollution, either by sewage or industrial waste—

The man who lives on the outskirts of a city and under the Constitution of the United States, as declared in decisions of the Supreme Court, has been dumping his sewage into such waters and decides tomorrow to build a house, with similar provision for his sewage, if this law is passed, is in danger of apprehension by the Federal courts and to trial before a Federal jury—

shall be permitted to be discharged into the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto until and unless approved by the Division; and—

Take the man who has a hogpen, such as one of my friends mentioned to me a few moments ago, should let some of the wash go into the water, what has he facing him? Let us see:

The discharge of new sources of water pollution without review and approval of the Division as required under the foregoing provisions is hereby declared to be against the public policy of the United States and to be a public and common nuisance. An action to prevent or abate any such nuisance—

The man who is building a house with the sewage that runs down into navigable water, or the man who is building a garage with a new source that goes down to the navigable water—

may be brought in the name of the United States by any United States attorney, and it shall be the duty of such attorney to bring such an action when requested to do so by the Division, the Surgeon General, any duly constituted interstate agency dealing with control of water pollution, any State agency dealing with control of water pollution, any State health authority, or any incorporated municipality. Such action shall be brought as an action in equity and may be brought in any court of the United States having jurisdiction to hear and determine equity cases.

Hitlerism run mad! Any attempt to impose such conditions as this upon the people of the country, without even a month to prepare for such a situation, would immediately drive municipalities and cities into bankruptcy or at least impede their growth.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman understand the amendment to mean that if I want to build a new house in my town and attach it to the existing sewers I would be prohibited from doing so?

Mr. BLAND. I cannot read anything else, and if it does not mean that, in the name of heaven let them say so, and not bring you up before a Federal court to be tried and then have it decided that it does not mean that.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, an apartment house or the home of a man in the city would drain into the city sewer?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And in that event the municipality does the dumping and not the builder or the owner of the house. The act would be but a continuation of existing conditions. Therefore the part of the bill referred to by the gentleman would make it impossible to bring the man whom the gentleman from Kentucky refers to within the scope of the bill.

Mr. MAY. He is subject to prosecution under the act.

Mr. BLAND. He could be brought to prosecution.

Mr. MICHENER. There would be no such prosecution, as this is an equity proceeding.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is the most far-reaching amendment that was ever submitted to a legislative body affecting the people of the United States. If that instrument, formerly known as the Constitution of the United States, is still in existence, I have very serious doubts of its constitutionality. I once investigated the law under which these actions may be brought as to whether the Constitution of the United States would probably protect these people. I think it would, but I am not going to take the chance of having my constituents brought into a Federal court and then have to appeal their cases and become bankrupt.

Mr. Chairman, our country and our Congress would be brought into disrepute by the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In our section of the State we have drainage ditches that flow into navigable streams and in some counties they are a mile apart. Would we have to come to Washington or to some agency in Washington to get a permit to have these drainage ditches flow into some of these navigable streams?

Mr. BLAND. In my opinion, yes; and every fellow, as my friend said a while ago, who built a pigpen, if some of the drainage was going into navigable water—and you can see how far that reaches—would have to come to Washington and say, "Please let me build my pigpen there." It is ridiculous. [Applause.]

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I may say to the gentleman that in my district there are, perhaps, 1,000 drainage ditches and they would have to have 1,000 hearings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If this amendment had been offered by some rabid new dealer, I might be able to understand it, but it is astonishing to me to find a member of the Republican Party proposing to establish here bureaucratic control over the lives and operations of the people and the business of this country, without definitions or standards, and without giving any opportunity for hearing or consideration of the facts involved on the part of anybody. Talk about bureaucratic government. Here is proposed an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to give a division in the Public Health Service the right of life and death over the operations of business and home life throughout this Nation. No new paper factory in my part of the country, for instance, could be established without the consent of the Public Health Service. No pigpen, as somebody has suggested, could be put where it might discharge some waste into a branch which runs into a navigable stream, without the consent of the Public Health Service, and yet you provide absolutely no definition of what waste is; no definition of what pollution is; and no place where a person can get a hearing and find out what his rights are under this amendment. It is the most far-reaching thing I have ever seen proposed in the way of bureaucracy.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. It goes even further than the proposal the other day against which gentlemen on the other side of the House voted almost unanimously in connection with the census bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Certainly. If you are talking about delegation of authority, and we heard a good deal about it in reference to trade agreements, this delegates all the authority in the world to a division of the Public Health Service. You could not do anything in the way of erecting a factory or a home that discharged any waste into a branch that ran into a river that is navigable without the authority and consent of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MOTT. Would the gentleman's objection be removed if this language in subdivision (d) of the amendment "until

and unless approved by the division" were removed? Would that remove the objection, simply making it mandatory law that no new pollution source should be emptied into navigable streams, and fixing a penalty for violation of that law?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think that would change the effect of it at all, because you are making it the public policy of the United States and giving the courts the right to enjoin a man from operating, and you have given no definition here or any language which tells a man what he can or cannot do. There is nothing in the bill that defines what is pollution or waste.

Mr. MOTT. If pollution were properly defined and the law were made mandatory prohibiting the doing of certain things and not leaving anything to the discretion of the division, would that remove the gentleman's objection?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot pass on something until I see it in language. I am objecting to giving an agency of the Government absolute authority without any possibility of a hearing, without his having his day in court, until he is dragged into court in the face of an injunction which might destroy the property that cost him thousands of dollars to build.

Mr. MOTT. Then the gentleman's objection is that this law places discretion in the hands of a division and makes violation of a regulation of the division a violation of law instead of the law being a mandatory one?

Mr. RAMSPECK. My objection is simply this: If we are going to prohibit industrial waste and pollution from going into streams, then that ought to be defined and there ought to be a procedure where a man can get a hearing and have his day in court, and a right to appeal from a decision of this agency, just as we set up in the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies of that type. If we had some such procedure as that, I think I would be able to go along. I am in favor of cleaning up the streams, and I am in favor of this bill as reported by the committee, without this amendment, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It seems to me that this matter of stream pollution which has been before this body for the last 22 years, and upon which some 16 or 18 hearings have been held, has been thoroughly discussed time and time again, and when those of us who are interested in sportsmen's organizations and the wild and fish life of the country come here in an effort to make even a small start, we have the Constitution and all of the hobgoblins in the world to contend with simply because we are making a start to clean up a situation which we all know is every day getting a little bit worse.

My able and distinguished friend from Virginia, the chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, than whom there is no more sincere or conscientious member, has conjured up the ugly picture of dictatorship, the exceedingly distasteful thought of Hitlerism, and has shed some crocodile tears for the little garage and even the small-home owner. He would have you believe that by the adoption of the Mundt amendment we are creating another governmental Frankenstein which we shall not be able to control.

Nothing is farther from the truth, and I am sure my good friend from Virginia will reverse his opinion once he has been able to read the bill and this excellent amendment in the cool and quiet of one of those lovely Virginia spring evenings.

I rise in support of the Mundt amendment. May I say that in 1924, if I read correctly, the Congress of the United States passed the Oil Pollution Act of 1924. I think that would well take care of the situation with reference to the question of any garages which my good friend has raised.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. KITCHENS. In my section of the country and many other sections of the country they are drilling wells for the discovery of oil, and in doing so they will pump water out of streams, which becomes muddy, and that water is permitted to run back into those streams. In the gentleman's opinion, would this bill require every man who wanted to drill an oil well to obtain a permit before he could begin drilling, and would each well be a new source of controversy?

Mr. HARRINGTON. If the Mundt amendment were adopted, and if the pumping of the oil and the water would create a new source of pollution, I would say that they would be subject to the provisions of the act.

Mr. KITCHENS. I am in favor of preventing pollution of our streams, but I would dislike to do anything that would so handicap certain business that it would make it too expensive for them to operate, such as having to come here to Washington on every occasion to get a permit.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I do not believe the Public Health Service, or this new Board that is set up, and whose members are taken from the Army engineers and the Public Health Service, is in any way interested in doing anything that will prevent any new industry which will give employment from going ahead. They would do nothing to prevent the drilling of new oil wells or the opening of new mines. I am sure they have very good sense.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In my home county we have a hundred and some drainage districts, which must have an outlet. Under the provisions of this amendment it would be necessary for every drainage district which might in some way contact a barn or a feed lot or water from a barn or feed lot, to go to Washington and get a permit in order to drain that water into a stream, which is a common-law right, which the people have had since time immemorial; that is, the right of the riparian owner to drain into the streams below. We would have to come to Washington and get that permit, would we not?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I think the gentleman is incorrect. In my opinion, unless there is new pollution, that would not be the case. Certainly the drainage ditches which are existing today, which empty into these streams, would not be new pollution, and that is all this amendment applies to.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. But by State law we construct other drains into draining ditches which go to these streams, and it would be a violation of the terms of the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not fair to say that the term "pollution," insofar as it applies to pollution of streams and water courses, has a very well-defined meaning which has grown up out of the usage and understanding of the people; and that the incidental drainage of a barn lot into a stream would never be held by anybody to constitute pollution such as is contemplated by this amendment? Is it not also fair to say that insofar as the Mundt amendment is concerned the only remedy has to do with injunctive relief; and insofar as the drilling of an oil well is concerned, a temporary operation that might for a very limited period of time bring about temporary pollution of a stream in some measure, would not be the sort of pollution that is contemplated by the amendment now being considered? Furthermore, is it not likely that the temporary pollution would be over and out of the way before it could ever be reached by injunctive relief?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman. He is an able and distinguished lawyer and I am not. I think that probably his statement answers any question which my good friends from Missouri or Arkansas had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Let me ask the Members of the House whether they ever heard that little bit of doggerel that goes like this:

The other day upon the stair
I saw a man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today.
I wish that man would go away.

They have been reading things into the Mundt amendment that simply are not there. It is directed against those who discharge pollution, not against the householders, as our distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] would make us

believe. They are reading into this amendment things that simply are not there.

The second section of the amendment makes it contrary to public policy to continue pollution. What a stupid piece of legislation this would be if you will permit an industry at the lower end of a stream to continue polluting and to get money from the Federal Government by means of grant-in-aid; to continue, and let the penalties of the law or restrictions fall upon somebody else. We have had that situation out in Illinois where one city was discharging its sewage into a river and another city simply threw up its hands and said, "We propose to do exactly nothing because our sister city upstream is not doing anything." New pollution must be stopped and existing pollution progressively diminished. That is the one and only remedy for this condition.

If you are going to get anywhere on pollution, we must first establish an absolute standard. Either it is wrong or it is right. If it is wrong, then we must make it a violation of public policy to continue the pollution. That is what the second section of this amendment does. The first section provides discretionary policy in the hands of the director of the division so as to take care of existing situations at least for a little while. If it is wrong to pollute on the 1st day of February 1940, it was wrong 20 years ago and it will be wrong 20 years hence.

There is involved here, of course, a large element of public health. Years ago I used to do some marine contracting on the Illinois River. I have had engineers get some of this putrid and putrescent disposal material in their eyes and had compensation cases to deal with. That is how poisonous the stuff is that is being discharged into the navigable streams of the country today. You cannot temporize with that sort of thing. You might just as well throw this bill in the waste can so far as its effect is concerned unless you establish an absolute standard and say once and for all that pollution is contrary to public policy.

Imagine back in 1905 passing a pure food and drug bill taking cognizance of the abuses that existed at that time but leaving the thing open so far as policy is concerned and saying, "If there are subsequent abuses in misbranding, and in adulteration of foods and drugs we will take care of them later." No; that is not what the Congress did. It said that misbranding and adulteration were wrong. Pollution is wrong and you cannot defend it by getting up on this floor and talking about bureaucratic control of administrative power lodged in some individual in Washington. Somewhere you have got to have a standard. Certainly you cannot have an enforcement of a standard unless it applies to all the States alike. It is the only way that the matter can be properly dealt with in the field of interstate commerce.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If that is the gentleman's view why does he not just advocate the passage of a criminal statute for the pollution of streams and be done with it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from the Labor Committee, that when they passed the Fair Labor Standards Act the first thing they did was to set out the policy. They did not pass a criminal statute and say they would take care of other abuses as they came along, they set a very definite standard and then started to make sure of its enforcement and administration by the presence of an absolute standard.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Where are the standards in this bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are no standards, but we are faced with the necessity for some kind of basic standard. That is precisely what the Mundt amendment does. Without it the bill is not worth the paper it is written on, and we will not have a policy unless the Mundt amendment is adopted. The idea of making Federal funds available to one polluter in order to get rid of pollution and then letting other people who are establishing new industries continue to pollute presents a ridiculous situation. There must be an absolute standard first, then we can deal with it intelligently and reasonably.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman has taken a very prominent part in the last few weeks in reducing expenditures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman realize that this bill opens the door of the Treasury to a new raid, the extent of which no one can foresee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know just what the gentleman is going to say. Knowing the attitude of my friend from Missouri as he pointed out the weaknesses in the bill, I propose, if he does not, to offer an amendment to strike out subsection (c) of section 8. Let us make the thing administratively possible rather than throw it into the discard. Let us correct it by amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. The only amendment the gentleman from Missouri would offer would be an amendment to strike out the enacting clause.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. In the event the Mundt amendment is adopted, it being an amendment to an amendment, no separate vote could be obtained in the House. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. BLAND. In other words, if the Mundt amendment is voted into the bill, no motion to recommit may be made in the House whereby it could be stricken out because it is an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the past few years Congress should have had plenty of experience in the granting of unlimited and undefined powers to bureaus. It seems to me that we have established in the past several years enough of these agencies to run wild throughout the United States and exercise bureaucratic powers to the nth degree and oppress the people through unreasonable laws, unreasonable rules, unreasonable decisions, unreasonable judgments that they in possession of bureaucratic power presume to make and enforce upon the people.

There is pending before us, Mr. Chairman, an amendment which is designed to give the bill a sort of window dressing, which is designed to give it favor in the eyes of some who believe we should have legislation with teeth in it to prevent stream pollution. I have been opposed to the pollution of streams for many, many years—in fact, ever since I can remember—and I have been constantly working in favor of legislation of this kind. But here we have what I am very much afraid is an attempt upon the part of those who pretend they are working in the interest of an anti-stream-pollution bill to sabotage their own work, especially when they try to graft into legislation of this kind an amendment which will make it unacceptable in the eyes of so many members of this Committee.

Under this amendment if a farmer were to butcher his hogs and scald them in the old-fashioned oak barrel, with a little wood ash in it, and would empty that water into a stream, he could be prosecuted under the terms of this amendment. If a farmer down in the South somewhere should open up a little sorghum mill to make some sorghum for his own private use, and would empty the rinsings and leavings into the stream, he could be prosecuted under the terms of this amendment. If a farmer up in Pennsylvania or Ohio should open up a little coal mine on his own land to dig coal to keep himself warm during the winter and some of that sulfur water should drain into the stream, he could be prosecuted. If any man, drilling an oil or gas well, put the pumpings of that oil or gas well where they might run into a stream, causing lime, salt water, or some other substance to flow into that stream, then he could be prosecuted under the terms of this bill. If a man set up a little sawmill and the sawdust should fall in a place where it might be washed into a stream, he could be prosecuted under the terms of this bill unless he

had previously come down to Washington and secured a permit to operate his own private business on his own private land.

If we are going to do anything about stream pollution, in the name of common sense, let us do something that is reasonable in the matter and not attempt to fasten on the people of the United States another superbureau with bureaucratic powers to go out and oppress the people of this country with any more autocratic rulings, such as some of the bureaus in existence are handing out at the present time.

Let us vote down the Mundt amendment and show the people of the United States that sanity is returning to the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] said that the Mundt amendment smacked of Hitlerism, I rather discounted the observation, because I thought it was one of those exaggerations in which we all indulge at times; but when this very able and sincere Democratic colleague of ours declared that this amendment, proposed by a Republican, was typical New Deal legislation, then I did become concerned and I wondered whether I had read the amendment right. I read it again and I am reassured. I do not concur in the opinion of the gentleman from Virginia that the Mundt amendment smacks of Hitlerism or that it is typical New Deal legislation.

I do not believe there is anything in the Mundt amendment that should concern those people who, like myself, are opposed to granting broad discretionary powers to executives. The Mundt amendment has only to do with the pollution of navigable streams and navigable streams have always been under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Also, in the exercise of that jurisdiction Federal officers have always and of necessity been given a certain amount of discretionary authority.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado for a question.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman evidently has not read the amendment.

Mr. MOTT. I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It says "navigable streams and their tributaries."

Mr. MOTT. Certainly. It affects navigable streams and their tributaries.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman know that every stream in the United States, no matter how small, is a navigable stream under the terms of existing law unless the Congress of the United States specifically by act of Congress declares it a nonnavigable stream?

Mr. MOTT. I think the gentleman is correct. A navigable stream is defined by statute. Now, when anyone in the United States wants to do anything in connection with a navigable stream he must get permission to do it from the Federal Government. If you want to build a bridge across a stream, you cannot do it without getting a permit from the War Department. If you are a farmer who lives on the bank of a navigable stream and you want to build a pier or wharf out into that stream, you must get a permit from the War Department. If you live on the Columbia River, for example, or on any other fishing stream, and you want to install a fish trap, you must apply for a permit from the Federal Government in order to put in that fish trap. The Federal Government will allow that installation to be made only if it does not interfere with navigation, and the question of whether it does or does not interfere with navigation is decided by the War Department. There is discretionary authority there, but no one would contend that it is dangerous.

The Mundt amendment undertakes to prevent, insofar as possible, the pollution of these navigable streams. It does not go into exhaustive detail in its definition of what stream pollution is any more than existing law goes into detail as to

what constitutes interference with navigation. But it requires that the permission of an appropriate agency of the Government shall be obtained before anyone may make a special use of that stream which may result in its pollution.

It is perfectly proper that such a person should make application to the proper Federal agency for a permit to do that, and the agency should have authority to decide whether the thing he contemplates doing will in fact pollute the stream or not. If in the opinion of this agency the thing contemplated to be done will pollute the stream, the permit will not and should not be granted. That is all the discretion there is in this bill. There is sound precedent for it, and I think it is not dangerous. It does not smack of Hitlerism, and, in my opinion, it is not even typical of the general run of New Deal legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill is a step in the direction we must take eventually, and I believe we ought to do it now. The elimination of stream pollution is essential to the health of the country; I believe everyone will admit that. It is essential to the fish life of the country, and that is a very important thing also. The pollution of streams is fast ruining the fish life of the country. It is destroying sports fishing, to the detriment of everyone. It is destroying commercial fishing, to the detriment of a great industry and to thousands who are dependent upon that industry for their livelihood. The pollution in the Willamette River near its confluence with the Columbia River, where it passes the city of Portland, Oreg., is now so great that a young fingerling salmon 4 or 5 inches long can survive only 10 minutes after being taken from pure water and placed in the polluted water there. The Willamette is the principal tributary of the Columbia, which is the most important and valuable salmon-fishing stream in the world, and which brings to the people of our State an annual revenue of \$10,000,000 from its fisheries. We in Oregon would like to see something started that will clean up this situation. I believe the pending bill takes a step in the direction that will accomplish this, and that does it without granting too much discretion to the Federal Government. It is an opportunity that should not be passed over by the Congress at this time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have read carefully the debate that occurred here on yesterday. I should be very glad to vote for the committee bill, but I am very much confused about the Mundt amendment. I represent a large industry, and I might mention to you that it is the cranberry interests. The cranberry farms, so-called, are generally on a lake or a stream, because flowage is by far the most important feature of that industry. During these latter days all sorts of insects, and constantly new varieties, seem to be found, and many, many kinds of poisons have to be used. There must be constant drainage of those swamps, and they are generally drained into some stream or back into a lake.

I realize the terrific blow that could be administered to that industry. I want to preserve the fishes in the ponds and streams. I fish a good deal in the lakes, but none of those streams or lakes I can think of are used for drinking-water purposes, but some of the poisons would unquestionably be regarded as detrimental to fish life, and, in fact, we know they are.

I want to support the committee bill, but if you force me to vote for something that might jeopardize an industry, I must be well informed before I do so. If this legislation affects that industry, it must apply to other such industries.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to assure the gentleman that his cranberry industry and all other existing industries are perfectly safe within the confines of the so-called Mundt amendment, because it applies only to new sources of pollution, so the new sources of pollution will not affect navigable streams. The amendment will not apply to ponds or lakes or swamps or bogs in any regard or in any way.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are finding new sources of poison all the time and new insects.

Mr. MUNDT. If you find a new insect and a new source of poison, you may still continue to poison the insects by securing the permission of the Public Health Service, exactly as you would get permission if you were going to build a dam or a bridge on a navigable stream.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do not put anything over on me, young man. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday while on the floor I called attention to the fact that the question of stream pollution was not a new one in this country. It goes back more than 20 years. It goes back almost 50 years. Since 1920 the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has had presented to it 65 different bills concerning stream pollution, and in those 20 years how many bills have you passed to solve this problem? One bill, in 1924, known as the oil-pollution bill, which had to do only with oil pollution of coastal waters, was passed. Therefore, in 20 years, out of 65 bills, you have enacted 1 and have not touched the problem as far as our inland waters, rivers, and streams are concerned. We have merely talked about the problem in this country, and in the meantime it has grown steadily worse.

Much has been said about the Mundt amendment. I can visualize a river in the State of Tennessee where there is one industry near the mouth of the river and another one about to be started farther up the river. We abate the nuisance of pollution by the old-established industry near the mouth of the river, and even lend it money in order to stop its pollution of the stream. How inconsistent it would be to permit a new industry farther up the river to start operations and begin the pollution all over again, thus nullifying completely what we have done for the industry near the mouth of the river.

In its broader aspects, all the Mundt amendment does is to prevent new sources of pollution in the future and from undoing all the work we have done through a cooperative attitude by the Federal Government; that is all this amendment does. It simply means that the Federal Government will cooperate with the States because all the police powers of the States are left intact and the States are to control the situation to a very large extent. How futile it would be not to endorse and include the Mundt amendment.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say just now that the condition has been getting worse? I have been hearing a lot of testimony here that we have been making a great improvement.

Mr. DONDERO. I am glad to have the correction. What I meant to say was that in the last few years since we have grappled with the problem we have made strides and progress, but in the years back of that the problem grew steadily worse and we did nothing about it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is assuming that the old offender will be abated. What assurance has the gentleman of that? Would not the Mundt amendment compel the new industry to discharge its sewage properly or process it before discharging it, and thus militate against that industry as compared with the old industry if the old offender was not abated?

Mr. DONDERO. As to the old, established industry's being abated, let me say to the gentleman that if he will look at the record and see the strides that have been made, particularly in the Ohio River Valley in the last few years, with 428 cities correcting the problem and doing so in a cooperative way with the Federal Government, he will see that we certainly have a right to expect that it will be abated.

Mr. CARTER. Then why not go on with that process? What is the necessity of setting up this bureau?

Mr. DONDERO. The answer to that question is that under this bill the cooperative encouragement of the Federal

Government is given to the States, cities, municipalities, and industries in aiding them to solve their problem more effectively and expeditiously.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not argued by those who say that we cannot use direct control in eliminating existing pollution that it will cost too much, that you are interfering with a situation that now exists and that the cost cannot be met? If this argument be true, does it not necessarily follow that the best time to begin to exercise reasonable control of pollution is before it occurs?

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. And the thing to do is to prevent, wherever feasible, and proper, new occurring pollutions coming along, consistent with a program which seeks, so far as possible and practicable, to do away with the unreasonable pollution that now exists.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct, and I might say that in the world of medicine much of the progress that has been made has been in preventive medicine. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 79, noes 51.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. FADDIS demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MUNDT and Mr. BLAND.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOLAN to the committee amendment: After section 5, insert subsection 5 (a), as follows:

"5. (a) Any State, municipality, or other public body which is discharging untreated or inadequately treated sewage or wastes into navigable waters of the United States or streams tributary thereto is hereby declared to be eligible to Federal aid in the form of grants-in-aid and/or loans for the construction of necessary treatment works, in accordance with plans approved by the respective State health authority and the Surgeon General. Such loans and grants-in-aid shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the President, upon the recommendation of the Federal Security Administrator, may prescribe, subject to the following limitations: (1) Grants-in-aid or loans shall be made only upon the certification of the State health authority having jurisdiction and upon approval and recommendation of the Surgeon General; (2) no grant-in-aid shall be made in respect of any project of an amount in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the cost of the labor and materials employed upon such project, including the cost of preparation of plans and the carrying of same into execution."

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply restores to the Senate bill certain provisions that were contained in that bill. The language of the amendment is in the pending bill, but under the amendment of the committee it is stricken out.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as set out in the amendments attached to the committee's supplemental report is so innocuous that it might be termed the most feeble legislative gesture at solving a national problem that ever has been proposed to the United States Congress.

We are faced with an extremely vexing problem in my district. According to the California State Department of Public Health, we have 60 percent of California's pollution problem on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay. When you add the flow of industrial sewage to the problem already created by the discharge of sewage from over a half million homes, the flow of refuse upon the shallow shore line of San Francisco Bay totals the equivalent of a discharge from a 1,200,000 population.

The Federal Government has a direct interest in this pollution, not only because the sludge is clogging up Oakland's inner harbor which has been dredged at Federal expense, nor because two of the largest Pacific Coast shore stations of

the Navy are situated in this area, but because of its control over the navigable waters of the San Francisco Bay, it has the common-law interest in the purity of these waters.

Without entering into the merits of the various work projects now being financed by the Federal Government in northern California, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we have, in the instance of this pollution project, a necessity for an expenditure of \$13,000,000, for which we cannot obtain Federal assistance. There is such a necessity for this project that I would put it ahead of our need for school buildings and hospital facilities. We can have Federal funds for hundreds of types of municipal developments, but today the House will deny us direct aid for the most meritorious of all our needed projects.

Our six principal cities have put their heads and their funds together and are presently conducting a \$60,000 survey of this project. They are doing their level best to qualify for an allocation of funds under this act as it passed the Senate. They want to rid northern California of a deplorable pollution problem which Dr. Parran of the United States Public Health Service has termed "a filthy mess."

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is absolutely necessary to perfect this bill. What good is an act for water-pollution control that provides for no control, nor does it extend any material inducement for control. That the appropriation authorized for surveys is negligible is apparent when our small San Francisco Bay project would require one-fifth of the amount which is to be allocated to all the States. Finally, no one can maintain that an R. F. C. loan is an inducement at its present rate of interest on loans to municipalities. I hope this amendment is adopted in the interest of a sound program of water-pollution control. [Applause.]

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to make a personal statement, but I feel that under the circumstances I am justified in telling you what I now intend to communicate to you. Because of the interest my people had in the elimination of stream pollution and because the measure was making no progress before the House, I took it upon myself to call upon the President and tell him how much we needed this relief. He said that he did not approve of the bill that was before Congress because it contained the provisions that have just been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN]. He said that they did not meet his approval and that they would unbalance the Budget. He stated he wanted the relief given to the people of the United States, but he did not feel he could approve direct grants, and the committee amendment that is before us was the result of a conference with Jesse Jones, who controls the organization that will make the loans; Surgeon General Parran, of the Public Health Service; Mr. Mansfield; Senator Barkley; and myself. The President said at that time he wanted the relief granted in the manner provided by the committee amendment.

Now, it may be that we are supreme in our legislative functions, but it would be a futile thing to pass legislation that we know will be vetoed by the President. I am hopeful that some remedial legislation will be passed at the present time and I am hopeful that the President will approve that legislation. I feel confident that if you place this amendment in the bill he will veto it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLER to the committee amendment: Section 2, after subsection (c), insert a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) *Provided, however,* That any such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon the signatory States unless it has been approved by the legislatures of such States and by the Congress of the United States subsequent to the approval of the various State legislatures."

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. I do this to state to the House that the amendment that I have just offered is the amendment which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] wrote, and which took the place of an amendment which I should have offered, in view of the position that I felt was necessary under the law; that is to say, that unless we put in this provision the bill would certainly be vetoed by the President; and when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] called my attention to that and himself refused to present the amendment, I took the privilege of doing so myself.

Mr. GAVAGAN. While the committee has agreed to accept the gentleman's amendment, so far as I am concerned, I do not agree to it with any understanding that Congress has no constitutional power to pass this as it is. Congress has control of navigable waters and tributaries thereto, and it has control of treaties made by the States, and it may in advance of those treaties give its consent. The only objection the President had was to the matter of procedure. Congress has all power.

Mr. KELLER. But if the Congress in advance agrees to those compacts, it ties the hands of Congress thereafter; and I fear with that, no matter what the States agree to, it would have been a foolish thing to put in the bill.

Yesterday I called attention to the fact that in the bill that has just been substituted for the Senate bill that in section 2, subsection B, on the line at the top of page 3, we should cut out the words "encourage compacts between the several States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution," and all of subsection C which I quote here:

The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and abatement of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and to establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts.

Pointing out that if the Congress should in advance consent to the compacts by the States, the Congress would thereby tie its own hands from interfering with whatever the States may see fit to do under these compacts and I gave notice that I would present an amendment eliminating that provision. I was pleased to find that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] had taken exactly the same view of it as I, and I have been advised by a number of other first-class lawyers in the House that this is the correct view, but the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] fortunately went further in the study of the matter than I had been able to do, and he proposed an amendment which, as I stated above, I presented in lieu of the elimination of the above provision.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] quoted a veto message of President Roosevelt on the subject and which I also here quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 14, 1939, page 15805:

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 11, 1939.

I have withheld my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 139, "To authorize compacts or agreements between or among the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean with respect to fishing in the territorial waters and the bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border, and for other purposes."

This joint resolution is not in conformity with the usual and accepted method of granting the consent of the Congress to the execution of interstate compacts or agreements, in that it lacks a provision requiring the approval of the Congress of such compact or agreement as may be entered into before it shall become effective. I believe that it would be unwise to establish the policy of granting in advance the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements in connection with subjects described only in broad outline as in the Senate Joint Resolution 139.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

It was and is my idea that not only is the question of stream pollution one in which the Government has full control but of which the Government certainly ought to keep control for

all time to come. I accepted the Bland amendment instead of my own only on assurance by the committee that the Bland amendment would be accepted by the committee and thus prevented a long-drawn-out discussion. I believe frankly that the States will hardly be able to arrive at any conclusions in the compacts that cannot be better achieved by the Federal Government, and I repeat that I only accepted the Bland amendment instead of my own to prevent a long discussion over it. No harm can come from it because, as it will be observed, after any compacts should be approved by the State legislatures, they would in no way be binding on the Federal Government until they had received the endorsement of the Congress and the signature of the President, and if and when any such compacts should come before the Congress, abundant opportunity will be given to point out the advisability or inadvisability of accepting it. I here want to repeat that, in my judgment, no compacts can be written by any convention of States which would be so effective or so desirable as action which may be taken by the Federal Government.

I do not feel that it is necessary to make the following statement but for the information of the gentlemen who are uninformed of my training along legal lines that while I have not held myself out as being a good lawyer and I have not indulged in the practice of the profession in years, I, nevertheless, doubt whether any man in this House had greater opportunity of growing up in the study of the law, the scholastic training in the law, and the university extension work, and the admittance to the bar in the State of Illinois at the head of a class of 73 in both written and oral examinations. I therefore feel entirely competent to pass on the fundamentals taught in the profession, notwithstanding my lack of recent practice in the profession.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 9, line 16, strike out the word "not."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a year or two ago one of the agencies downtown appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and secured what funds it needed for a half dozen different functions. When it came back the following year we learned that they had taken some of the money which had been appropriated for specific purposes, and used much of it to pay for personnel that was later loaned to a Senate committee. We made it plain to them at that time that when Congress appropriated money for a certain function, it ought to be used for that function. The language in the bill at the present time provides that the Public Health Division can use funds out of any appropriation and divert them to that purpose. Obviously that flies in the face of such good appropriation practice, and should not be in the bill. By striking out the word "not" in line 16, it merely means, and it is obvious, that they can use the funds appropriated for the purpose of antistream pollution and for that only, and that they cannot dip into a fund appropriated, say, for some restriction against typhoid fever, and use it for antistream pollution.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman does not mean to imply that a part of the Public Health Service should be prevented from collaborating with another part of it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman regards that as one of its functions, does he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but if they are given \$250,000 say for antistream pollution, that should be used for that purpose.

Mr. CULKIN. But they can exchange ideas and collaborate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely; and that is not stopped by this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 29, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made earlier in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, as amended by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are about to vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN] as amended by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which, in effect, is whether or not the bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN] as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARTER) there were—ayes 86, noes 21.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise. Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 685) to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 249, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOPPAGE OF AMERICAN MERCHANT SHIPS AND AIRPLANES BY BELLIGERENTS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report on House Resolution 391 from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 391

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable moment all information as to the American merchant ships and airplanes, by name, that have been stopped by belligerents since September 1, 1939; this information to include in each case the nationality of the belligerent stopping the American ship, the port or ports which the American ship was compelled by the belligerent to enter, the length of time spent in each such port, and the action the belligerent took by way of removal of cargo or mails.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the information asked for in the resolution is on file in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I therefore ask that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN BRIDGES ON RIO GRANDE

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7809) authorizing the reconstruction or replacement of certain bridges necessitated by the Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from New Mexico permit the inclusion of the amendment which we have discussed if the bill is now considered?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will be very glad to; yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state generally what the bill is about? Is this the bill for which a rule has been granted?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, it is.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman just state briefly what it is about?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The canalization work on the Rio Grande being performed by the State Department through the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, is almost complete. During the canalization work certain of the county bridges have been rendered useless because of a change in the channel of the river. Authority was granted originally under previous law to replace and repair any privately owned or municipally owned structures damaged by this work. They did not give authority to repair county owned bridges, which was just an oversight. The municipally owned bridges have been repaired, and these are county owned bridges, which are in the same category.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This legislation is made necessary by reason of the fact that the original act provided that privately owned bridges and municipally owned bridges should be replaced, but it omitted to designate county bridges, and they have held that "municipal" does not include "county." There are a number of county bridges which it is necessary to repair or replace in order to carry out the intention of Congress in the original act.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct. The bill is recommended by the Department of State and has the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the approval of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not a fact that the intention of the framers of the bill and of the State Department, and also of the Congress, was that county bridges should be included just the same as private and municipally owned bridges?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. It was intended that any damage done to any bridges would be repaired and structures rendered unusable would be replaced as a matter of public convenience and necessity.

Mr. THOMASON. And it was a technical oversight, was it not? This is a meritorious bill and I very much hope no objection is made to its present consideration.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; that is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State, acting through the American Section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized to reconstruct or replace certain bridges over the Rio Grande within the Rio Grande canalization project known as the Courchesne, Country Club, Borderland, and Vinton Bridges in El Paso County, Tex., and the Berino, Vado, Mesquite, Shalem, and Hatch-Rincon Bridges in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., and such other bridges within said project as the Secretary of State may determine to include.

SEC. 2. That notwithstanding the limitation imposed on the total cost of construction of the Rio Grande canalization project by section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose," approved June 4, 1936, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$350,000, which shall be in addition to appropriations heretofore authorized for such project, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 1 hereof, other than for operation and maintenance, including salaries and wages, fees for professional services; rents, travel expenses; per diem in lieu of actual subsistence; printing and binding, lawbooks, and books of reference; purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger- and freight-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment; acquisition by donation, condemnation, or purchase of real and personal property; transportation (including drayage) of personal effects of employees upon change of station; telephone, telegraphic, and air-mail communications; rubber boots for official use by employees; ice; equipment, services, supplies, and materials and other such miscellaneous expenses as the Secretary of State may deem necessary properly to carry out the provisions of the act:

LXXXVI—141

Provided, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured when the aggregate amount involved is \$100 or less: Provided further, That no part of the appropriation herein authorized shall be expended for the construction of any of the bridges to be located within any county until the governing body of such county has given assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of State—

(a) That it will cause to be furnished, without cost to the United States, evidence satisfactory to the American Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, that title to all lands or easements in lands which may be designated by the said American Commissioner as necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridges and approaches, the title to which is not vested in the United States, is vested in the county;

(b) That it will perform without cost to the United States all work involved in any required changes, including changes in pavements or other road surfaces, in the approaches or approach roads to the bridges to be located within such county;

(c) That it will, upon notification by the said American Commissioner that any bridge has been completed, take over and operate and maintain such bridge; and

(d) That it will hold the United States harmless on account of any damage or claim of damage arising out of or in any way connected with the construction, operation, or maintenance, or failure to operate and maintain, any bridge or bridges or any part thereof located within such county;

And provided further, That no part of the appropriation herein authorized shall be expended for the construction of any of the bridges to be located in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., until the governing body of said county has given assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of State that it will remove or rebuild, in accordance with plans and specifications to be approved by the American Commissioner, the bridges known as Old Anthony Bridge and Salem Bridge.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 8, after the word "bridges", insert "county."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Page 3, line 6, after the word "less", insert "and provided that not more than \$3,500 shall be expended for the purchase of real property and expenses incidental thereto."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 399 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTER of Ohio, Mr. MILLS of Louisiana, Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan, and Mr. DEMPSEY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] on the subject of the pink bollworm.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some articles on the question of freight rates in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by I. J. Kent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein

an address made by Senator BRIDGES at Casper, Wyo., on the 17th of February.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] in Buffalo, N. Y., on February 24.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by Senator BRIDGES in Enid, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I have received from the Minneapolis Junior Association of Commerce regarding the report of the conferees on the Wheeler-Lea bill, and also a resolution from the city of Minneapolis opposing the Wheeler-Lea bill and asking 30 days' time in which to consider the conference report when it is brought up.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT] may be excused on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the legislative program for the day and the special order that I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM A. DICKSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce to the membership of this body the death of a former Member, the Honorable William A. Dickson, of Centreville, Miss., who served during the Sixty-first and Sixty-second Congresses.

Mr. Dickson was a grandson of Dr. William Winans, a pioneer Methodist minister, who immigrated from Pennsylvania to Mississippi territory and established his home near Centreville, and whose grave is a shrine of Southern Methodist.

Mr. Dickson served his county and State in many capacities prior to his election to Congress. He received his degree in law but never practiced his profession, spending his entire life when not actively engaged in performing the duties of the office he held following his greatest love, that is, agricultural pursuits. He was one of the greatest orators it has been my privilege to hear; he was a statesman of the years-ago type. He was respected, loved, and was a great factor in the progress and upbuilding of his section.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, as long as there are a very large number of Republicans here, I ask their attention for a minute or two.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned in one way and another that there is an insistent demand throughout the country to amend the National Labor Relations Act. I have learned that many of the Republicans, as well as a few Democrats and new dealers, want that act amended. I have been wondering

why it was that we did not get about the business of doing what the people wanted us to do.

The Smith committee has disclosed enough of a situation which does not appeal to very many of us, so that we have information justifying the abolition of the Board. If I read the signs correctly, some day Congress will get rid of that Board; and as long as we are going to do it, we might just as well do it now as to wait until additional industries have been closed.

Not only that but the Smith committee has disclosed weaknesses in the law itself. There is no question about it. I know that Mr. Pressman, before the House Committee on Labor, stated there was no demand throughout the country for the amendment of this law. There is not, of course, any demand among the Communists; and Mr. Pressman, counsel for the C. I. O., has been engaged in activities which have done a great deal to further the interests of the Communists.

It being true that a majority of the House wants this law amended, there is no reason why we should not start now. The chairman of the Committee on Labor the other day said out here in the corridor that the House Labor Committee was going to wait until the Smith committee finished its investigation.

The Smith committee, we are told, next week or the week after, will make a report; then the matter will go to the House Labor Committee. But that report of the Smith committee is to be a preliminary report; it is not to be the final report.

The chairman of the House Committee on Labor controls that committee; there is no question about that. If the chairman of that committee is going to wait for the final report of the Smith committee, it will be along toward the last of March or the first of April before we will get anywhere at all with the House Committee on Labor. The only way we will ever get out a bill to amend the national labor relations law and take care of and discipline that Board the way you want it to be disciplined and taken care of will be by discharge petition. If we wait 2 or 3 weeks for the Smith committee to come along and make a preliminary report, then if the chairman of the House Committee on Labor holds up that report, waiting for the Smith committee to make its final report, where are we going to get? We will be doing just the same as we have been doing for more than a year—just nothing at all, except hold hearings. You might as well put an old hen to setting on a nest full of doorknobs and expect a hatching of Plymouth Rock chicks as to proceed as we have been doing for more than a year.

There are two or three members of the House Labor Committee present, and if I am not correct, I would like to hear from them. We will continue to have the situation of getting nowhere at all unless we can get a discharge petition signed. That is the reason I put petition No. 23 on the desk. It does not make any difference whether you like the bill I introduced a year ago in March or not. Let us bring out some bill under an open rule, then amend it on the floor as you wish to have it amended; otherwise we will not get any action during this present session.

Republicans have been acting in good faith, and I can see no reason why we should not do something now to bring this matter before the House at this time or as soon as we can get it up for consideration? Why wait and let the Labor Committee fool along and the session come to an end with nothing done? There is only one good reason I can think of for that course, and that is that the failure to amend the N. L. R. A. is some of the best campaign material we can get; but that is a poor reason if we have in mind the interest of our country as a whole. That is why I am speaking to you today. That is why I have spoken so often before. Let us show our good faith by doing our utmost to bring before the House a bill under an open rule, debate it, then act, and let responsibility for refusing to abolish the Board and amend rest upon the majority side.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman is an attorney. He would not want a case to go before a jury with only half of the evidence

in? Does he not believe that the House Labor Committee should have all the evidence before it decides?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The House Labor Committee has had 10 months. I am an attorney, but if I were on a jury trying a man for robbery, when I had evidence enough to know that the man was guilty of robbery I would not care much about other evidence. I would convict him of the offense of which he was charged and shown to be guilty and disregard evidence of other alleged offenses.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman would not care about what defense was put in?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not say that at all. I said when the evidence showed conclusively guilt of the offense charged I would act after the one accused had been heard in his own defense. The gentleman does not defend the activities of this Labor Board, does he?

Mr. HOOK. Well, I want to know what the facts are before I make my decision.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman know now?

Mr. HOOK. I do not want to decide on half facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman know now?

Mr. HOOK. I certainly do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman know the Labor Board has had full opportunity before the Smith committee to present its case, that the Labor Board has been in charge of the time for almost a week, and does not the gentleman know that over before the House committee the C. I. O. attorney, Pressman, has had 3 hours on one occasion and that he put in 300 pages of typewritten statement, refusing absolutely to answer simple questions directly? Does not the gentleman know that the Board took up days before the Senate committee and before the House committee, last year and again this year, in presenting their view?

Mr. HOOK. If the gentleman is correct, why does not the Smith committee close its hearings?

(At this point certain words used in debate were, by unanimous consent of the House, withdrawn from the RECORD.)

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman's words taken down. I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words taken down.

The Clerk read as follows:

I presume they want to pile up such a mountain of damaging testimony against that Board and the unfairness of the law so that even the gentleman from Michigan, who never can tell whether a document has been forged or whether it has not—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the reference made in the words taken down of the gentleman from Michigan relate to his colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], who the Chair understands is the gentleman that requested that the words be taken down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was referring to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], as the Chair understands it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was answering a question the gentleman asked me, and I did not complete the sentence, which I should like to do.

The SPEAKER. The rule on the conduct of Members in debate is that a Member, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personality. The Chair is of the opinion that the phrase used by the gentleman in connection with the statement in reference to his colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], "who never can tell whether a document has been forged or whether it has not," transgresses the rule and is a personality.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the Chair permit me to submit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I am asked a question by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], then how can I make reply without referring to him personally?

The SPEAKER. In reply to the question, the Chair suggests that the gentleman might say, "In response to the inquiry of my colleague from Michigan."

The gentleman from Michigan himself has invoked this rule regarding personalities on several occasions and the gentleman is very familiar with the rule. The Chair has sustained the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan on most of those occasions. The Chair thinks the gentleman should withdraw the words in question; at least, the Chair holds that they transgress the rule.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw those words, and to substitute in their place the statement that I presume the Smith committee wanted to pile up a mountain of evidence showing the maladministration carried on by the Board, and the serious defects in the law itself, so that any gentleman in or out of the House might know for a certainty that we should amend the law at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOOK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is the present status of this matter that everything that has been said will appear in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The words have not been withdrawn or expunged, therefore they will appear in the RECORD. The Chair has ruled with reference to their propriety.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to table the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I object to his withdrawing the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is withdrawn.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin to table the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 27, noes 35.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Two of them, in fact. The first is that I may be permitted to withdraw the words, and the other is that my special order for next Monday may stand.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the first request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman already has his special order for next Monday.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TRANSCONTINENTAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth consecutive year that I have had the pleasure and privilege of calling the attention of the House to the advisability of building a system of transcontinental and north-and-south highways across the United States.

As you will recall, I said last year in presenting this measure to the House that when I first presented it it seemed the major element of importance in building such a system of highways was transportation of commodities of all kinds. This would not only save time but money.

After further study it was brought out that inasmuch as industry was not absorbing the hundreds of thousands of unemployed, the building of such a system of highways over a space of years would give worth-while employment to a large group of men.

Then, about 2 years ago, when the wars across the waters created certain international problems, it was almost unanimously agreed that such a system of highways completed would be a major factor in national defense, in that we would have greater flexibility and thus greater economy.

During these recent years the problem of slum clearance of our cities has been talked of, and in some respects different Government agencies have taken steps toward solving this problem. From many parts of the United States people have written me and called my attention to the fact that such a system of highways as I propose would be a real major procedure in helping to solve the overcrowded city population problem.

You recall that I propose these highways should not run through the cities, that they shall bypass the cities at a safe distance.

I hold in my hand a copy of the message from the President of the United States transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, concurred in by the Secretary of War, inclosing a report of the Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Agriculture, on the feasibility of a system of transcontinental toll roads and a master plan for free highway development. This House Document No. 272, transmitted by the President April 27, 1939, is a most commendable document indeed. The Bureau of Public Roads and other agencies that had to do with gathering the data, compiling it, and furnishing Congress with the information, deserve much credit. It is only from such data, statistics, and findings that we can formulate plans that will eventually crystallize into a reality.

As you will observe on the map here, my plan calls for three highways running east and west and six running north and south. These highways are spoken of sometimes as super-highways, transcontinental highways, and so forth. I believe this report refers to them as intersectional highways. I believe their plan calls for running these highways right into the cities. I think it would be a mistake in building highways of this magnitude to run them into the large cities.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why do you end one of these north and south highways at the lower end of Lake Michigan instead of going on through to the end of Wisconsin?

Mr. SNYDER. I am sorry that was not done. I was going to do that, but I did not have the time to take it back. It should go right along here [indicating].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman does not intend then, under his program, to have this highway end at the Illinois State line but end at the Canadian-Wisconsin border?

Mr. SNYDER. That is exactly it and that is what is called for in my speech, but I did not have the red tape to put it on the map here.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Did I understand correctly that the gentleman intends to stay out of the big cities entirely and just go around them, under this highway plan?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, I do. Further on I would like for your comment on what I am about to say in that respect. I believe, however, that their plans call for running these highways into the cities. I think it would be a great mistake to build highways of this magnitude and run them into our cities, and if you will follow me for a moment I will be glad to have your comments, either pro or con, on that phase of this great and important question, because I believe, I may say by way of parenthesis before taking up the next para-

graph here, that we are all agreed that such a system is going to be built. It may be it will not run along the same lines as I have suggested, but such a general system of highways is going to be built, whether you think so or I think so, because, as the Nation is being built up, they have got to build such a system of highways for our transportation, and when we build them, we might as well build them for a thousand years as to build them for 10 or 15 or 20 years, and you cannot build them for a thousand years by running them into the cities, as I will show you in a moment.

In these days we are interested in decentralizing the population of our cities—not adding to it. We are spending money through various Government agencies, such as Federal Housing, United States Housing, to clear up slum districts in the cities. Slum districts in certain of our large cities have been materially helped during the last few years all of which is commendable.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are thinking in terms of community-building and Nation-building construction that is to be handed down through the generations to come, it seems to me the one big thing that we could do at this time would be to build such highways as my bill calls for that would pass close to the cities but not directly through them.

For instance, if we were to build a highway from Baltimore to Columbus, St. Louis, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco, it should not pass through any of these cities. It should be made as straight as possible, and if it happens to be 10 or 20 miles from a large city, all the better. We can have byroads leading from such highways into the large cities.

We have all observed that when a permanent road is built from one city to another the people in those cities will buy acreage out along the road and move from the city out there.

We also find that things have changed from a standpoint of manufacture. These days much of the manufacturing is done by electricity and much of the transportation is done by truck. If we had these highways, hundreds of manufacturing concerns would move their manufacturing plants away from the congested parts of the city, down by the water front or railroad front, out along these highways, and thus be able to not only manufacture their commodities cheaper, but they would be on the highways they were going to use in distributing their products.

Our cities sprung up in our valleys, at the junction of rivers, at certain appropriate coastal fronts and harbors, largely because the railroads had to seek as level a surface as possible in building the railroads, and they found that to be along the river-bed levels.

Instead of taking these commodities by truck and rail into the cities, as they are largely doing now, and thus creating a more congested population, my plan would draw the people out along these highways to build their factories, build their homes, and distribute their manufactured products much more economically.

Furthermore, the land values along these highways for miles and miles back of each of them would be increased. The farm-truck growers would have facilities that would enable them to distribute their commodities at less cost than they are now being distributed.

My friends, if these highways were completed today as set forth in my bill—some 16,000 miles—in less than 20 years we would have at least 10,000,000 of our population living along these highways; and most of them, I believe, would be in homes that they owned.

The more home owners you have in a democracy the easier it is to perpetuate a democracy in any nation. If home owners in a nation drop below 40 percent of the population it is not only extra expensive but extraordinarily difficult to perpetuate a democracy.

I have been informed by the fruit growers associations, from the East and West, as an example, that if such highways were completed today they could distribute their commodities to the consumers at from 12 to 15 percent less than they now distribute them. That could be said also of manufactured products from our manufacturing centers that must be distributed through the Nation.

I hear some of you asking, "What about the cost of such a system of highways?" Well, as set forth in my bill, it would cost approximately one-half million dollars a mile.

Up in Pennsylvania today we are building a turnpike highway from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg. The present distance you are obliged to travel between these two cities is about 206 miles. The distance on the new highway, when completed, will be approximately 161 miles. This highway will have four lanes, and the grade will not be more than 3 percent at any one point, and no sharp curves will be on it.

This highway is being built by a grant from the Federal Government and a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at a cost of approximately \$61,000,000. It will be completed about July 1, 1940, according to contracts. This will be a great highway, and before construction was started much research and study was given to the possibility of travel on this highway. They found that all types of business favored its construction. The big truckers favored it especially.

For instance, it is figured that large trucks, that will be charged \$10 toll on this road from one end to the other, will willingly pay this because they will be saving more than \$10 a trip by using this road instead of the up-and-down mountain highway.

Instead of taking 12 or 15 hours to make the trip, it will take only about 5 hours for such a truck to make the trip, and that will be a saving of about two-thirds in time the driver will consume—to say nothing of gas, oil, and wear on the truck.

This turnpike was started under the Earle administration about 2½ years ago. When the present administration came into power, Governor James had expressed opposition to going on with the highway; but after he gave it thorough study he decided to cooperate and has cooperated toward its completion. Now, instead of opposing it, he advocated that it be extended from Harrisburg toward Philadelphia and New York.

Another group met in Chicago recently and advocated the extension of this highway from Pittsburgh on west through Ohio and Illinois.

So you see the day of such highways is here, and I think that the Congress of the United States should take action that will result in seeing to it that these highways are built so they will last not only 50 years but 1,000 years, and that they will be built to serve all the people instead of certain communities.

During the last few years we have strengthened our national-defense set-up from every angle. We are going to continue to do that, but I believe that my colleagues will all agree with me when I say that a system of highways such as I propose would be a greater contribution to national defense in case of an emergency than any other one item.

Our national-defense installations are not for aggression. We are preparing so that in case any foreign foe would choose to disturb our institutions, either on our shores or inland, that we could prevent them from doing so. Such a system of highways would enable us to put on rubber wheels practically all of our Army equipment—such as guns, antiaircraft material, trucks, tanks, and what not—and move them in a short space of hours from any one point of the United States to another point.

Another feature of these roads as set forth in my bill is that they will be 100 feet wide, thus providing 8 lanes of traffic with a 500-foot right-of-way. No obstruction would be allowed on such rights-of-way, such as telephone poles, light poles, signs, and so forth. That would mean that the long stretches across the continent—take for instance the middle highway as I have set forth to run from Baltimore to San Francisco—could be used as an emergency landing field. Of course we would have the 18 airports at the intersections as the bill calls for. In other words, we would have a main street across the Nation. At night it would be lit up as any main street in our large cities today.

Our air service would always be safe from the standpoint of having safe-landing facilities. We would have

radio stations at intervals along these highways and if a plane would be in trouble, all the pilot would have to do would be to radio down that he was going to land in section 17 or 18 in 2 or 3 minutes. The radio operator would then stop traffic and enable a mile or two of the highways to be a landing field for that emergency.

In reading this report I notice they have counted traffic on certain highways and have based their conclusion on certain types of roads to be constructed to take care of that amount of traffic. If the traffic load seemed to be heavy they would build a highway to take care of more traffic at that particular point.

I doubt the wisdom of such a procedure—that is, if we are looking forward 100 years from now as to taking care of our traffic problem, population, and farmers.

In other words, I think we should build these highways so it will give opportunity for expansion of business, industry, and manufacturing, to come out along these highways instead of trying to crowd men into the same areas that we now have, and thus add to the congestion and more difficult living conditions.

We have made wonderful progress in the last few years in stabilizing our economic and social forces. We have put several million more men to work, but we still have other millions to put to work. We find we are now turning out as many tons of steel as we did in certain months 20 years ago when things were at a peak—yet we are not employing one-third as many men to turn out this commodity. In other words, machinery has replaced the men. So it is in every industry—not only the steel industry.

Therefore, we should put these men to work on worth-while projects—and no project that I can think of would be more worth while than this highway program. We could put a million or more men to work for the next 8 years on this system of highways, and their children would have something to point to with pride as an accomplishment in years to come.

I have included in my bill the language:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$8,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. * * *

However, I am not tied to that. I would prefer to see the roads built with private capital given out by contract to the lowest bidder.

For the last 25 years our people have drifted into a piecemeal financial procedure along all lines. A number of States have a sales tax. They take a few pennies from everybody for most of the things they use in everyday life. Business concerns are educating our people to pay so much a week on this or that article. Insurance companies have taught our people to pay so much a week on insurance policies. Business concerns as well as the Government have resorted to paying employees once a week or every 2 weeks—making everything piecemeal.

So you have a people educated to doing things in little dribbs. That being the case, the toll highways would be in keeping with the other practices. I have always favored gasoline tax. The fellow who does not have a car or does not use his car does not have to pay the tax. The same would be true of toll highways. You say he would pay indirectly. Of course, he would pay indirectly. We pay indirectly for everything that we use and the other fellow uses.

I am going to give this one instance as a citation, with your kind permission. When I first came to Washington 8 years ago, my wife and I, coming from the country, we would drive out in the country, and on one occasion we went out to Soldiers' Home and then drove down Blair Road. I think you know where that road is. I thought they had a planning commission here in the city of Washington that would not allow them to do certain things, and maybe it is all right and maybe I am all wrong about it, coming from the country as I do, but when I went out there this spring I was really, I might say, chagrined, because I found that they had allowed them to go out there and build a whole row of houses along an entire block, just like one solid house. We would call it a shed out on the farm. Perhaps it was five or six hundred

feet long. They put porches and steps and a door here and call that a home. Then they would put a porch and a door at another point and call it a home, and then sell a slice of it to some fellow for a home.

That is the way we used to do in the mining towns in western Pennsylvania, because they would usually be temporary. In my own county we built mining towns like that, and we would just build long strings of houses and divide them with partitions and put people in there as an emergency for the mining work, because, perhaps, the mine would be worked out in 8 or 10 or 15 years, but here in the city of Washington that same general plan is being followed right in the Capital of the United States. You have noticed around Philadelphia, if you were ever over there, and around Baltimore, where they did this kind of building 30 or 40 years ago, the slum clearance has now reached out to them and they are trying to do away with that sort of building; but right here in the Nation's Capital they have built a lot of them of that same type within the last 2 or 3 years. My comment, from what little I know about preparing for generations yet to come, is that they should not be allowed to build such strings of houses in this day and age and divide them up into coops to shove people in and then allow them to invest their money in one slice of such a house, when they do not know who is going to move to the right of them or who is going to move to the left of them in the next 5 or 10 years, or whether its value will jump up or jump down because of what might be shoved onto the right or left of them.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Unfortunately, I was not in the Hall when the gentleman began his address, but about what would be the construction cost of the gentleman's program, including the rights-of-way?

Mr. SNYDER. About \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How long does the gentleman think it would take to construct them?

Mr. SNYDER. Eight or sixteen years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Would the roads be free roads or toll roads?

Mr. SNYDER. I have left that question open as to whether they should be toll roads or free roads. I have a comment I want to make on that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Would they be for general-traffic roads—that is, commercial roads—or just tourists' roads? Would large, heavy busses and trucks and things of that kind that push people off the highways be permitted to travel on these roads?

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for that inquiry. I am pleased to say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that these roads, running 16,000 miles, approximately, would be 100 feet wide, with eight lanes of traffic, with a clearance of 200 feet on either side, making a 500-foot highway the whole distance across the Nation. Certain lanes of traffic would be for heavy trucks and certain lanes for lighter trucks. There would be certain lanes for speed trucks, up to 90 or over 100 miles an hour.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The trucks and busses would be separated from the ordinary lanes?

Mr. SNYDER. They would have their own lanes of travel, and I might go ahead and say in connection with that that there are two aspects of this project. I took the matter up with the California Fruit Growers' Association and also with the Southern Fruit Growers' Association and certain textile people. They tell me that if these highways were completed now, they could distribute their fruit products from the West to the East at a 12 to 15 percent less cost to the consumer than they can now distribute such products.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And that would mean that they could do that because of the subsidy furnished by the Federal Government in providing a roadbed, and that would be the beginning of a proposition to put out of business and destroy the railroads.

Mr. SNYDER. And may I answer the gentleman there in respect to the subsidy and say that while my bill calls for \$8,000,000,000 out of the Treasury, I would rather that private industry build the roads, which would be perhaps toll roads. Let me say this about the toll roads: I know everyone will be interested in what I am about to speak of. Some of you have heard about it, but you have not had the opportunity to know about it as I have. In Pennsylvania we are building what they call a turnpike highway from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg. Already there are two highways there—the Lincoln Highway and the William Penn Highway, two to four lanes wide. The distance over those two highways are approximately 206 miles. This new turnpike was begun by a grant when we had the P. W. A., plus a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be built at a cost of \$61,000,000. It will shorten the route from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg from 206 to 160 miles, with four lanes of travel, with no grade over 3 percent, and no curves on it where you cannot see about 2,000 feet ahead. The comment is this: They expected that it would take 16 years to liquidate this loan from the Government, but now, as it is nearing completion—and they expect to throw it open July 1—the trucking companies and all kinds of companies are coming in for rates; and they find in the estimate now that in 10 years this will be liquidated because of the use that is going to be made of it. For instance, it now costs a 10-ton truck loaded to capacity \$37 to go up and down those mountains to move that load from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg. When the new road is constructed, instead of its taking from 12 to 15 hours to do that, they expect to do it in 5 hours; and the cost, instead of being \$37, they expect will be \$17 to move that load from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg, a saving of \$20. The way it is set up now is that they will charge \$10 toll for a truck of that kind and \$1.25 for an ordinary automobile for use of the road over those 160 miles.

Now, if you were in Pittsburgh and you were going to Harrisburg, you would have a choice of one of these routes. It is 206 miles by the present roads, and it is up and down at least seven mountains. Or you could go over this new highway. There will be no compulsion about it. The people do not have to use this road, because there are two splendid highways paralleling this. They cross over and under at least several times. But we people in America, the greatest people on earth, have been trained to do things by bits. Personally, I have never supported what we call the sales tax, but I have been in the State of Alabama and in the State of California and in the State of Ohio on some army inspection tours, and I drop in to buy this or that or to buy some food, and I find that they will tax me for even my food a few cents extra. These high-powered salesmen come around to our homes and they will sell a sweeper, or this, that, or the other, and we pay in dribs. Even the Government got down to the practice of paying in dribs, paying every week. Personally, I am opposed to that. I think the much better practice would be to pay every month, so that they would get something in their hands that would look worth while. But the point I am trying to build up is that we have educated our people through all of these different processes to little dribs of payments, and they do not mind paying the toll now as they did 20 years ago. They pay their tolls without any question. I would say that 90 percent of the people if they were in Pittsburgh and wanted to go to Harrisburg, no special reason for them to get there, would inquire about the highways. They would be told, "You can go over the Lincoln Highway. It is a two-lane road, very beautiful, 206 miles, over the mountains. You can go over the William Penn Highway." And they would tell them about that. Or they would say, "You can go over the new turnpike and you can make 60 to 90 miles per hour. There are no curves on it to speak of," and so forth.

I say 90 percent of them would pay the \$1.25 and go on the new highway and buzz their way to Harrisburg.

The point I want to make in connection with all that is, it does not matter which procedure we go through to build these highways, whether by private contract or whether the Gov-

ernment loans the money to certain corporations with certain specific regulations, or how we do it.

One of those regulations, before I forget it, is that all those who are above 50 years of age would be employed first. That is, it would give employment to those men that industry has set aside and will no longer take back. That would give employment to that large group. We might even go down to 45 years of age on such a proposition.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. THILL. There are a lot of young boys between the ages of 18 and 22 or 24 who are unemployed.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. THILL. Would you give them work, too?

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad you mentioned that. The group of older men that would take these places first, if they could not fill all the places the young men would be given the next chance. One of the greatest dangers to this Nation is that we have too many young men whose minds and hearts are not employed and their footsteps are not being guided in the right direction at this particular time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman indicated that the program would cost about \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In the words of another distinguished Member of the House from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. SNYDER. As I say, my friend, if we build it under contract authorization, like we are building this turnpike, we would liquidate it in so many years; the money would all come back.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Under your program you do not intend to commence the building of all of the roads at once, do you?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, that would be a matter that would have to be decided. If I were to do it I would build No. 2 highway first across the Nation. Then I would build this one second and I would build that one third, that is, if we built them piecemeal. If I would start this one I would start it over here where the population is great, and where we need a lot of employment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman thought of using W. P. A. labor? If you start construction of one of these highways, will not the employment on such highway be far more beneficial to America than producing burlesque shows such as Up in Mabel's Room, Swing Mikado, and many similar activities of the W. P. A.?

Mr. SNYDER. Very much more so. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. I wonder if the gentleman has enumerated in his tables and statistics here how much concrete, stone, sand, and gravel, and building materials, man-hours and man-days of work on such a project as this would be provided for people, directly and indirectly, in this country?

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. The cost of building the highway per mile in Pennsylvania is \$350,000 a mile. Now we go through seven mountains. There will be seven tunnels on this road. Some of them are short. I think one of them is a mile and a half long.

To buy a right-of-way 500 feet wide would cost approximately \$500,000 a mile. In some rocky, swampy places it would cost more, and that through level land would cost less. Following out the suggestion made by the gentleman, in addition to putting a million men a year directly to work, the building of this system would put another million men to work in collateral lines preparing and furnishing the materials entering into this great Nation-building structure; and if I had my way, I would build it like the Appian Way was built, to last 1,000 years.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. THILL. I notice on the map the gentleman is using there are indicated six north-and-south highways, three in the eastern half of the United States and three in the western half. Does not the gentleman think it would be more advisable to put more highways in the more populous East than in the less populous West?

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry that a study of the eastern half of the country showed that there were a great many parallel highways of the type I spoke of in the case of the new turnpike running between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg; and that is why this adjustment was reached.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. How wide did the gentleman say the right-of-way for the highway would be?

Mr. SNYDER. Five hundred feet.

Mr. PARSONS. Has the gentleman figured how much productive land that would take out of cultivation in the agricultural areas?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; but I have not the figures with me. I will insert them at this point. I think that would not be objectionable because we are taking a lot out of cultivation by law anyhow.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman thinks it might be a step in the right direction looking to the relief of the farm problem.

Mr. SNYDER. I think so, and a step in the direction of putting men to work.

Mr. PARSONS. I notice that on the map the gentleman has indicated a highway running, I believe, from Chicago directly south.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. Does that go to New Orleans or does it stay east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. SNYDER. It goes to Baton Rouge.

Mr. PARSONS. It crosses, then, the Illinois, the Ohio, and the Mississippi on its way to Baton Rouge.

Mr. SNYDER. That is it exactly.

Mr. PARSONS. And then goes on down to New Orleans.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. PARSONS. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It has developed during the course of the gentleman's talk that the construction of these highways would greatly relieve unemployment and would relieve the farm problem in the manner just related by our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS]. Would not the building of at least one or two of these highways greatly increase the effectiveness of our national defense and enable us thereby to reduce many of the excessive expenditures we are now making for national defense?

Mr. SNYDER. I had intended to comment on that later in my speech, but I will do it right now since the gentleman has raised the question. That is one of three important objectives to be achieved by the building of this system of highways. The first is general transportation, the second is relief of unemployment, and the third is a strengthening of our national defense.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Another thought that occurs to me in connection with the building of this system of highways would be that it would enable people to move from congested areas out into the country where they might have little farms to help them eke out a living.

Mr. SNYDER. I am coming to that. Speaking for the moment about national defense, if these roads were in existence today, or on April 1, 1941, with the advances we have made in motorized rubber-wheel equipment in the Army, we could cut \$100,000,000 from our national-defense program that year and still have greater efficiency in national defense than we have ever had; and in 3 years we could jump the saving to \$200,000,000, for by that time all our equipment will be motorized and on rubber wheels, even the 12-inch guns.

The rest is on wings. In 72 hours we could have any of our equipment at any place where there might be an emergency, if we had a sort of concentration area in the middle of the country. In making these statements I draw on my experience of having visited practically every military establishment in continental United States and our possessions. Not only would we save money in case of a real emergency but we would save money on every one of our big Army maneuvers. That is not all. We know that in 12 hours we can go with airplanes from any place in the United States to any other place. In 72 hours we could go any place on rubber wheels with everything we have except above 12-inch guns. In keeping with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] said, over a period of years, in connection with national defense alone—say, in 40 or 50 years—these roads would pay for themselves by reduction in national-defense installations.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If we constructed a system of roads of that kind, what would eventually become of our railroads that apparently the Government is going to have to take over ultimately?

Mr. SNYDER. May I say this before answering the gentleman's question: In building these highways, we built Route 40. We call this Route 40.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRINGTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, we would have a main street clear across the Nation. It would be lit up at night. You would not put in any lights higher than the curb at the side. You may say that I am an extremist in this thing, and perhaps I may be, but you can visualize airplane traffic in 10, 15, or 20 years going from East to West. Now, there would be a main street clear across the Nation, lit up all the time and no longer would we have crashes in the Rocky Mountains. How would we do that? This is not new. It is just the same as they are doing in Germany today. They have a route over there running from Brussels to Berlin.

Now, we would have radio stations all along the line and we would divide it up like the railroads did into sections. I do not know whether a section would be 5 or 10 miles, but there would be a radio station at each of these sections. A pilot gets into trouble. He radios that he will land in section 17, 16, or 87, if he is out here, in 3 minutes. They close the traffic on either side and he has an emergency landing field clear across the Nation.

My bill also calls for 18 big air bases, one at each of these crossroads. Now this is just exactly what the railroads did. The railroads built their main lines, then they run branch lines out from the main line. What would happen here? The shuttle air lines will run out to these main air lines, there they will pick up passengers and commodities on the main-line routes across the Nation. That is happening already. In 15 or 20 years from now you will be amazed to see what will take place along the lines of such procedure.

I am glad the gentleman from Montana brought up that question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman include in his answer to the question just what will become of the millions of men employed by railroads if we substitute the gentleman's road system for the railroads?

Mr. SNYDER. I have been conducting hearings on the Army bill.

Mr. RANKIN. They would drive automobiles.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman. I have been conducting hearings on the Army bill today. We are doing away with a certain number of horses. The question was asked of the general who was sitting across the table, "What are you going to do with these men who have been doing this work

with horses, trucks, and so forth?" The general had an answer, and he had them all classified. He stated: "We have taken so many men, and we are having them as truck drivers. We are taking so many men, and we are making them caretakers at the places where we fix the trucks." They had it all figured out how they were going to take care of the men.

May I make another statement right here? I happen to be a very personal friend of the president of one of our railroads, one of the finest men the Nation ever produced. I said to him in a little conference in connection with the Army engineers: "You people by your action did this to my father." I was born and raised along the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and we looked upon that railroad with as big eyes as the youngster who goes down here and looks at an airplane now. We would go down on Sunday evenings to watch No. 49 come in. We would watch those big trains go by. They would not stop. This was when I was a boy. We would get carloads of lime and phosphate. We would haul our ties down there and put them on cars, and they would take them away. Later on, about 1920-30, the railroads themselves said, "We don't want that business." How did they do that? There was a distance of about 25 miles between a place called Rockwood, a small town, and another town called Confluence, and in that distance there were about seven stops and two flag stops, and these were little towns that got their goods by railroad.

The railroad had agents there to wait on them. The railroad took the agents away and took the service away. They stopped running the local freight that brought in the goods, the train that used to come down there every day. The local freight would come in and take a carload out, leave an empty car, and take away a carload of lime or phosphate or some other commodity. That was all done away with. They said by their action, "If you, Jeremiah Snyder"—my father's name—"if you want to get your phosphates, come up to Rockwood, 4 miles away, or to Confluence, 15 miles away. If you want to haul your pit props, since there are no sidetracks, haul them up to Rockwood or wherever you want." In other words, the railroads themselves took away the facilities.

I am strong for the railroads. I wanted to be an engineer when I was a boy. But when the trucks and the concrete ribbons got to taking away the business, then they began to cry and say, "My goodness, help us, help us lest we perish."

Sure; but they did not try to help themselves. As I said, for 25 years I did not see a single improvement in railroad equipment, except that they built bigger cars and bigger engines, more splendid ones. What I have reference to, however, is better service to serve these people. They were producing more commodities and more tonnage of all kinds in the farm district to which I have reference in 1930 than they were back in 1903-4-5-6, when I was a young fellow, but still they had much better facilities for transportation then by railroad, three, four, five, six times over, than they had in 1930. The railroads took away the facilities. I remember they got these boxes that they put cranes on and they put them on flat cars, and they would come to your town and drive up a truck and distribute the equipment.

Well, that does not serve. In other words, the railroads—and I am for them—are here to stay for a long, continuous haul for certain kinds of service, and we have to take care of these men. I am not for turning the railroads out now. I will vote for any bill which provides that if they do away with or consolidate the railroads, the railroad men above 50 years will have to be provided for by pension or in some other way. We dare not turn them out.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I am a former railroad man myself.

Mr. SNYDER. Good.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that if some of the men were transferred to truck-driving service it would furnish a great deal of additional employment?

Mr. SNYDER. It would take care of a lot of them.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This is so because a railroad with its big power uses a crew of five men to move a train of 110 cars, but to move the same amount by truck you would need more than 110 truck drivers.

Mr. SNYDER. A very good point.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin may I say that I have been told by railroad men who have engaged in the operation that it would take about 5 trucks to haul 1 carload of freight, so that instead of having 110 men it would take about 500 men.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I agree that it would take that many, but I aim to be conservative in my statements.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can say that I railroaded also. Let us assume, now, that we substitute the gentleman's road scheme for the railroads, and we will say that, as our distinguished friend from Wisconsin has said, it would increase employment. Does the gentleman believe a man who has served until he is 50, 55, 60, or 65 years of age as a conductor on a railroad or as an engineer, a brakeman, a flagman, or in any other different line of mechanical work, would be competent to learn a new method of transportation and take over new methods of transporting goods?

Mr. SNYDER. Above a certain age, I would pension him. I would not ask him to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that I know a man above 50, a railroad conductor or engineer, and so forth, could not apply himself to a new kind of work, and I would make special provision when I voted for such a bill in the Congress that he be pensioned in a certain way or taken care of in some other way. If they are below that age, they can drive trucks and they can do other work along the highways. They can be watchmen or they can do a lot of things.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the gentleman would not want to take a man out of employment when he was only 50 years old and give him a pension, because men dry up if they have nothing to do, and die as a result of idleness.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. I do not believe we can stop the progress of this country. We are way behind now in building our superhighways, as the gentleman calls them, and I believe nothing can stop them. Conditions will adjust themselves; there is no question about it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on this very point?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman correctly stated that if we do develop superhighways there are certain long-haul and heavy materials which will have to be hauled by the railroads.

Mr. SNYDER. That is it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And you will need these older men whom the gentleman talks about. If you can furnish jobs for the younger men under your program, if it is found feasible and we can find out where we are going to get the \$8,000,000,000, you might furnish jobs for many former railroad men who cannot get a job at present. Men with 20 years' firing rights cannot even get a job on the firemen's extra list on most of the railroads today, even though they have been promoted as engineers for 18 years.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I am tremendously interested in the gentleman's remarks and in the program that he is fostering, and

I notice on the map which the gentleman is exhibiting to us that the gentleman starts his southernmost east and west transcontinental route at about the north line of the State of Florida, and it runs parallel with the coast and very close to it until you strike Texas. I am wondering if it would not be a wiser plan and serve more people if you would raise that line, say, 100 miles or some such distance, so as to make your three east-and-west routes more nearly synchronous.

Mr. SNYDER. I think the gentleman's suggestion is very appropriate, and since I first drew this I have changed it, as the gentleman knows, several times, because I saw that the possibilities and the suggestions, such as the gentleman has made, may add to the fruitfulness of the program.

Mr. HOBBS. In other words, there is no one now living south of that line and, therefore, if you put it up 100 miles you would serve double the number of people.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; but I do want to answer this one question and that is about building roads through the cities. When you stop to think, you realize that our railroads were built where they are for only two or three reasons. First, they had to go along the stream level so they will be level enough to build, and then the towns sprung up because of the junction of some rivers coming into the valley or at some seaport, and that is why the cities sprung up where they are now. If you go to Baltimore or Boston or Philadelphia or New York or Pittsburgh or down in the valleys along these railroads, you will find they had to put their manufacturing establishments there in order to get their commodities on the railroads. Now, 60 or more percent of all these commodities are transported by trucks, and they have to get down into the cities and get these trucks out and, of course, at that time steam was the power that was used. Now, 70 percent of all the manufacturing that is carried on now is done with electricity. Therefore, if we build a road from here to Boston and do not go to Baltimore; do not go to Philadelphia; do not go to New York, but stay out of such places 10, 20, or 30 miles, factories that use electricity would spring up and be established along the roads and the home owners would multiply along these roads. Thousands that we are trying to take care of and get out of slum districts would go out along these routes and get homes somewhere near these factories, and that is not all.

Trucks that transport their goods would be right on the roads instead of coming up out of the hollows and getting on the roads. If these roads were completed today and put into operation, within 20 to 25 years there would be 10,000,000 of our people who would have built and be living on these highways.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Did the gentleman have any particular purpose in mind in omitting the State of Montana in connection with his plan?

Mr. SNYDER. No; I did not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The plan does not, however, include roads across the State of Montana.

Mr. SNYDER. We will have to look into that.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman has demonstrated a very interesting plan of highway construction by Federal funds.

Mr. SNYDER. Perhaps Federal funds and perhaps not.

Mr. LUDLOW. Did the gentleman contemplate cooperation by the States and to what extent the States would benefit by these highways?

Mr. SNYDER. The best plan, I think, they could use in building would be the plan used by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Association. We could perhaps get \$8,000,000,000 of gold out in Kentucky and build the roads on a toll plan and pay it back in from 40 to 50 years.

Mr. LUDLOW. Has the gentleman thought of the percentage of contribution by the States and the apportionment of the costs so that the States would share in the cost?

Mr. SNYDER. My present thought during the last 2 years, as I said in the beginning, is to have the roads built so that they would be self-liquidating in from 20 to 30 to 40 years.

Mr. KELLER. But as a matter of fact, the plan the gentleman is suggesting is necessarily merely suggestive rather than real, and it will be necessary to have the whole matter carefully surveyed before there could be a real plan?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; and I am very glad the gentleman has made that observation.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, I had done this work 20 years ago.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; I was about to comment upon the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois put in a somewhat similar plan about 20 years ago.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. As a matter of building these separate highways, would they not effect great economies in lifting loads over those hills and mountains, and would it not be a great saving in gasoline, and might we not need to save gasoline for future generations?

Mr. SNYDER. I think the gentleman was not in the room when I explained before about the situation in Pennsylvania where, by the construction of the turnpike from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg, we will be able to save money and time.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. And it would increase employment of people now engaged in the railroad business. In the railroads they have a slogan of 1,000 tons per man. I used to be a conductor myself. In a truck this would mean five men and 5,000 tons, and with the trucks now it is impossible to move those loads.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon in relation to an amendment which I offered, which was adopted, to the stream-pollution bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMITTING UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN LANDS AT ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 424, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to acquire certain lands at St. Petersburg, Fla., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. As I understand it, the gentleman has taken this matter up with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; with the ranking minority member. I have permission to bring it up. The committee is familiar with it. I explained the amendment to him. I have his permission to bring it up, likewise the permission of the chairman of the committee. The amendment is just a technical amendment. It is a purely technical description to take care of a typographical error.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How much money will this cost our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. This is one case in which we are actually making the Government a gift. It is to correct the description of the property which we are to give.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "4" and insert "6."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a very brief editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRINGTON). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE WHEELER-LEA BILL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes regarding the transportation bill, known as the Wheeler-Lea bill, S. 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly interested in the railroad problem and the welfare of our great rail transportation system, as all Members are.

I am also interested, of course, in the welfare of the employees of the railroads and, of course, the welfare of our other transportation systems and the Nation in general.

A few days ago I made some remarks in the House regarding the effect which the adoption of S. 2009 by the Congress will have on the Railroad Retirement Act. In that statement I called attention to the fact that unless we retain the Harrington amendment in this transportation bill it is very likely to completely bankrupt or badly disrupt the Railroad Retirement Act because of the fact that under that act when originally put on the statute books it was presumed we would have an annual pay roll of approximately \$2,200,000,000 for about 1,000,000 railroad employees on the pay roll, which was approximately the number on the pay roll at the time of the adoption of the act.

Along that line I want to read two paragraphs from some testimony of Mr. George M. Harrison, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives Association, who appeared on behalf of the Committee of Six appointed September 20, 1938, by the President of the United States to submit recommendations upon the general transportation system. These are taken from volume 1 of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, on the bill H. R. 2531, in January, February, and March 1939.

The question was asked by Mr. Martin:

When reorganizations or consolidations are effected, does it have the same effect of reduction in the management itself, officials, or supervisory personnel as it does with the employees? How is that taken care of?

I might point out here that in connection with my remarks the other day I also mentioned that if we let out 350,000 railroad employees, as is predicted by President Whitney, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, as will happen if we adopt S. 2009 without the Harrington amendment, it would not only bring down the number of employees and thus cut down the annual pay roll but that it will leave in employment the older employees, who will thus be in a greater percentage as to the whole, and would thus make a still greater drain on the funds of the railroad retirement pension, as there would be more retiring, proportionately speaking.

The answer which Mr. Harrison gives to this question by Mr. Martin is as follows, and proves exactly the point which I made the other day. Here is Mr. Harrison's answer:

Well, here is about the way it generally works: Most of our supervisory and management staff members have been promoted from the ranks. They retain their rights to the classified service while they are so occupied; and should they discontinue a position of one of those persons, they would then slide back, or go back, I should say, to the classified service. Generally, however, they find some other employment in the managerial staff; and there is not, generally speaking, the same reduction in the official family—as we workers call it—as there is in the classified service when those changes take place. They generally put them out to doing something else. If you merge two freight stations and they only need one agent, they would probably give the other agent a job as a traffic solicitor or something like that. If you merge two offices and you had two superintendents, they will probably give the other superintendent a job as an assistant superintendent. If they do not have one, they probably would create one for him. That is about the way it works out. Now there are exceptions to every rule, but that has been my experience.

It bears out the point which I made—that there will be a still greater drain than the mere reduction in numbers in employment and pay roll on the Railroad Retirement Act.

Now, there is also another interesting item arising at this time in this connection which I wish to call attention to this afternoon.

The opponents of the Harrington amendment, finding themselves without a logical argument against its inclusion in the omnibus transportation bill, are now resorting, among other things, to a distortion of the facts. They are endeavoring to becloud the real issue by seeking to prejudice the Congress against the amendment by attempting to lead the Members to believe that the labor organizations have broken faith with the railroad managements. They are calling attention to certain facts and basing their contention thereon, without giving you all of the facts, which, when known, must entirely change your conclusions. It is my desire to make the whole matter clear.

They are telling you of an agreement entered into in May 1936 between the 21 standard railroad labor organizations and representatives of a large number of the carriers. This agreement is generally referred to as the Washington jobs agreement, by which those railroads signatory thereto have agreed to pay to employees displaced because of coordinations, unifications, and consolidations, 60 percent of their wages for a limited time. Such compensation is for varying periods of time, starting with 60 percent of their salary for a period of 6 months for those employees with more than 1 year and less than 2 years' service, and graduating upward until all displaced employees with 15 or more years' service are to receive 60 percent of their wages for 60 months. Sixty months is the maximum, and, regardless of the length of service being more than 15 years, they are limited to 60 percent of their wages for 60 months.

The opponents of the Harrington amendment are contending that because of this agreement the railroad employees should not now ask Congress to incorporate such an amendment in the omnibus transportation bill. They are claiming that while this so-called Washington jobs agreement is in effect the representatives of the employees are honor bound to refrain from attempting to protect their membership to any greater extent than is embodied in the agreement.

For more than 50 years the railroad labor organizations have been entering into contracts with the various railroad managements; for almost as long they have been coming before the Congress and the various State legislatures asking for legislation affecting their employment; but now for the first time we find those speaking in behalf of the railroad interests contending that because of an agreement having been entered into they are now breaking faith when they are asking for legislation on the same subject matter; and notwithstanding the further fact that such a move is made necessary because of the railroad interests' own attempt to get new legislation on the statute books by passage of S. 2009.

You will understand that in none of these agreements, including the so-called Washington jobs agreement, is there any restriction on either party from exercising his rights as a citizen to endeavor to have enacted legislation which will be beneficial to those they represent.

Those speaking for the opponents of the Harrington amendment seem to have forgotten that Congress enacted the so-called 8-hour-day law at a time when practically every one of these railroad labor organizations had contracts with the carriers providing for a 10- or 12-hour day; and few, if any, had contracts providing for an 8-hour day.

Those of you who were in Congress at that time will recall that there was no contention then that the representatives of railroad labor were breaking faith and that the 8-hour law should not be passed because of those agreements providing for 10- and 12-hour days.

It is well known by most, if not all, of you that the railroad brotherhoods are, from year to year, having introduced in State legislatures bills which give greater advantage to their membership than the contracts which they have entered into with the managements. In more than half of the States

there are full-crew laws of one type or another which were enacted providing for additional men on certain trains. These laws were enacted at a time when the railroad labor organizations had contracts with many railroads providing that a lesser number of men would be required on those particular trains.

We all know that contracts must of necessity only provide for those things upon which the minds of both parties meet and do not in any way indicate that the contract as signed is entirely satisfactory to either party or that the signing of a contract with reference to a certain matter is any indication that those signing the contract agree that the contingency to which a contract refers and controls is a necessity or even desirable. Because I contract with an insurance company to indemnify me in case of loss from a tornado does not mean that I favor tornadoes. The principle is plainly demonstrated by the statement of President A. F. Whitney, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in the July 1936 issue of the Railroad Trainmen, the official publication of that organization, in which he said with reference to the Washington jobs agreement of May 21, 1936, immediately following the signing of that agreement:

I want to emphasize that so far as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is concerned, the agreement with the carriers relative to consolidation and coordination can in no sense be interpreted to mean that the way is clear for railroad consolidation and coordination. This brotherhood will continue to fight as vigorously as it always has such efforts to economize at the expense of humanity. * * * We have now entered into an agreement with the carriers, designed, not to improve the standards of living or working conditions of railroad workers, but to share with them a small portion of the booty that would come to the coupon clippers if Wall Street's demand for "economy" at the expense of humanity is carried out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to recognition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Until the so-called Washington jobs agreement was signed in May 1936, there was no general agreement between any of the railroads and the representatives of railroad labor which would in any way compensate displaced employees when consolidations, coordinations, and so forth, were brought about. Therefore, while the representatives of railroad labor realizing that this agreement fell far short of protecting the interests of those they represented, it was, after all, something, where heretofore, they had had nothing, and was signed by representatives of many, if not all of those organizations, only because it was the best agreement they could persuade the representatives of the railroads to sign. There was no thought that this agreement was any different than any previous agreement entered into between them and the railroad managements, with respect to seeking further protection for their members.

Certainly, had it been in the minds of either party that by signing this agreement they were obligating themselves not to seek desirable legislation on that or any other subject, that fact would have been set forth in the agreement. But even so, it would be unconstitutional for any group of citizens to attempt so to sign away their civic rights to petition their Government, and this Congress could not well respect such an undemocratic agreement. Therefore, I say to you, those who are now attempting to make such a preposterous interpretation of the so-called Washington jobs agreement are laboring under a delusion that has no foundation in fact, in justice, or in law, and are doing so only because they have no reasonable grounds for their opposition to the Harrington amendment, and because they well know that no argument they have so far advanced is sufficient reason for its elimination from the bill.

The opponents of the Harrington amendment are also contending that the provisions of the amendment are unenforceable and unworkable, and yet these are the same people,

mind you, who are calling your attention to the similar Washington jobs agreement.

If the Washington jobs agreement is workable and enforceable, why is not the Harrington amendment? They differ only in degree. Therefore the signing of the Washington jobs agreement by the representatives of the railroads indicates that the Harrington amendment is workable and enforceable, and that the principle of protecting jobs in railroad consolidations is just and reasonable.

President Daniel Willard, of the B. & O. Railroad, and others, have said that 80 percent of the savings from railroad consolidations come from savings in labor costs. Therefore, consolidations entered into under a law containing the provisions of the Harrington amendment will permit an immediate saving of 20 percent of the present cost of operation which is derived from sources other than labor. As the number of those employed upon the railroads at the time of consolidation is reduced from 7 to 10 percent, as it is, each year by men resigning, going on retirement, and so forth, the salary paid to that 7 to 10 percent will then divert to the holders of railroad securities. After a period of 10 or 12 years the full savings brought about by consolidation will be enjoyed by the holders of railroad securities. The railroad employees, whose ranks have already been depleted more than 50 percent since 1920 and who are in no way at fault for the present financial condition of our railroads, will not have taken from them their property rights to an opportunity to earn a livelihood which is rightly theirs because of many years' service upon the railroads. They will not be thrown into the bread lines of our country and be added to the millions who are now seeking employment. The solvency of the Railroad Retirement Act will not be jeopardized by having removed a large part of the pay rolls that sustain the act, thereby upsetting the basis upon which was based the present tax rate to provide for railroad retirement insurance as I explained at the start.

It is because of these reasons which I have pointed out that I call upon each and every one of you to insist upon the Harrington amendment being incorporated in any law enacted by this Congress which in any way changes the present law with regard to consolidations. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very scholarly address delivered by a former Member of this House and also a Member of the United States Senate, former Senator Hawes, of Missouri, at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration of the founding of Bourbon County, Ky., last September, and to include also an address delivered on the same occasion by Hon. Cassius M. Clay, counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

S. E. C. SHOULD ENFORCE HOLDING COMPANY ACT—EVERY CITY SHOULD OWN ITS ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER SYSTEM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call upon the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission to exercise the authority under the laws which we passed several years ago giving them the power to break up the large utility holding companies that were then, and are now, making a veritable racket out of the electric light and power business.

The Associated Gas & Electric Co. is a fair sample. If the S. E. C. will squeeze the water out of these gigantic concerns, eliminate the waste, graft, and extravagance and break them up as the law provides, they can reduce electric light and power rates and save the consumers of electricity in this country hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

The time has come for the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out the law passed by Congress and to break up these large holding companies that are now urging them to postpone the day of reckoning, while they continue to fleece the investing public and suck the economic lifeblood out of the electric consumers.

By breaking up these vast holding companies they can render their subsidiaries amenable to State laws. Then if they want them dissolved, as many of them should be, the various distribution systems can be sold back to the municipalities and cooperative associations throughout the areas involved. They can then reduce electric light and power rates to the T. V. A. level and in that way save the people millions, if not hundreds of millions, of dollars every year that rolls around. I know it has been charged that the rates in the Tennessee Valley area, or what we know as the T. V. A. rate, are too low. I want to show in the course of my remarks that municipalities throughout the whole country can produce and distribute electricity at rates below the T. V. A. yardstick levels.

T. V. A. GREAT BLESSING

The T. V. A. is the greatest blessing that ever came to the electric consumers of this country, the ones who pay the bills. It is teaching them what electricity is worth—what it should cost them. It has been the greatest force of all in compelling reductions in light and power rates throughout the country by \$583,000,000 a year, and it will aid us still more in bringing rates down to their proper levels, which will mean a further reduction of \$1,000,000,000 a year. I will prove to you that the T. V. A. rates are not too low.

ILLINOIS—SPRINGFIELD

Since there has been so much said about Abraham Lincoln recently, I am going to begin with Springfield, Ill., the home town of that illustrious man who lived there three-quarters of a century ago.

Springfield, Ill., owns a municipal plant and distribution system. Springfield is a city of 89,000 people. Its plant and distribution system are valued at \$4,392,162, on which it owes \$1,385,000—it has been paid down to that figure out of its revenues.

In 1938 that system generated and distributed 60,067,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, at an average rate of 1.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, whereas the T. V. A. yardstick distributes power at an average of 1.4 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Springfield sold this electricity for \$925,294, its operating expenses amounted to \$546,279, and it made a gross annual profit of \$379,015. If it had given this \$379,000 back to the ultimate consumers in the way of reduced rates, it could have sold its electricity below the T. V. A. yardstick rates. The same thing could be done in every other community in Illinois.

OHIO

Let us now turn to the great State of Ohio, where we are threatened with an epidemic of Republican candidates for the nomination for President, and see what is taking place in that State. The city of Cleveland owns its electric plant and distribution system. Cleveland is one of the large cities of the country, with a population of 918,000 people. It owns a municipal plant valued at \$18,367,000, which has been paid down to \$2,138,000 out of its revenues. In 1938 they generated 185,201,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, which was sold to the ultimate consumers in Cleveland at an average of 1.9 cents per kilowatt-hour. The operating expenses were \$1,972,000, leaving a gross annual profit of \$1,624,000. If this gross annual profit had been given back to the ultimate consumers in the way of reduced rates, their electricity would have cost them less than the consumers in the Tennessee Valley pay under the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

Let us take the city of Columbus, the capital of Ohio, with 325,000 people. Columbus has a public plant and system valued at \$1,870,000, which it paid down to \$442,000 out of its revenues. In 1938 that system generated and distributed 57,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity which it sold to the ultimate consumers for \$695,268, or at an average rate of 1.2 cents per kilowatt-hour, which is 2 mills less than the average retail rate in the T. V. A. area; yet the city of Columbus, with an operating expense of \$409,399, made a gross annual profit of \$285,869. If this profit has gone back to the consumers in Columbus, as is done in the T. V. A. area, they could have reduced the electric rates to the ultimate consumers to around 7 or 8 mills per kilowatt hour, or far below the T. V. A. rates.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is that electricity generated by the municipal plant in Columbus, Ohio, generated in a hydroelectric plant or steam plant?

Mr. RANKIN. In a steam plant.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Then the figures which the gentleman has presented clearly indicate that the local communities can operate electric generating plants far cheaper than the New Deal bureaucrats who are on the Federal Government pay roll in Washington.

Mr. RANKIN. No; but far cheaper than the Power Trust is charging the people of Wisconsin for electricity—in the gentleman's own State.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Due to that fact, the gentleman should be willing, I take it, to support legislation which will take Uncle Sam out of the electric-generating business and let the local interests generate electricity in accordance with the States' rights principles of government?

WISCONSIN

Mr. RANKIN. The Power Trust is not interested in States rights. That issue is not involved. The American people are being overcharged \$1,000,000,000 a year for electric lights and power, and over \$20,000,000 of that amount is being wrung from the helpless consumers of Wisconsin every year that rolls around.

Here is a city in Wisconsin that has a public power system, the city of Manitowoc. Let us examine it.

Manitowoc, which has a population of 26,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$1,704,601, on which it owes nothing, having paid for it out of the revenues.

In 1938 it generated and sold 21,050,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$362,406, or an average of 1.7 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$169,672, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$192,734.

If instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Manitowoc was 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is about half the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Wisconsin. The average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Manitowoc for all the electricity he used was only 2.4 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute bulletin.

If all the people of Wisconsin got their electricity at these Manitowoc rates, they would save anywhere from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a year.

WINNIPEG, CANADA

The firm of Burns & McDonald, consulting engineers, of Kansas City, Mo., has published a small book on municipal lighting plants that everyone who is interested in this subject ought to read. It contains reports on 717 municipal light and power systems.

Now, let us take a look at Winnipeg, Canada, just over the line, and see what their rates are under public ownership.

The city of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, Canada, which has a population of 222,454, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$27,807,910, on which it owes \$12,106,271.

In 1938 it generated and sold 580,274,805 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$3,160,061, or an average of 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$1,185,892, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$1,974,169.

These rates are far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Winnipeg was 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is far below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the United States. The average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Winnipeg for all the electricity he used was only 8 mills a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the United States for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

People in Winnipeg have been heating their houses with electricity for 25 years, just as many are now doing in Tupelo and Corinth, Miss., and just as they will be doing in every State if we can stop this racketeering on the part of the utilities.

ONTARIO

Now let us examine some of the rates in Ontario. Here are two splendid examples.

The city of Fort William, Ontario, with a population of 25,050, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$855,694 on which it owes \$184,760.

In 1938 it generated and sold 46,889,720 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$347,704, or an average of 7 mills a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$312,762, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$34,942.

These rates are far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumer in Fort William was only 1.89 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is less than one-third the average maximum rate charged by private power companies throughout the United States. The average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Fort William for all the electricity he used was only 6 mills a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the United States for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Many people in Fort William are heating their houses with electricity. It is the best and cleanest heat to be had.

The city of Port Arthur, Ontario, Canada, which has a population of 21,449, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$1,795,480, on which it owes \$10,808.

In 1938 it generated and sold 169,675,791 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$822,682, or an average of 5 mills a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$837,329, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$14,647.

These rates are far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumer in Port Arthur was only 1.8 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is less than one-third the average maximum rate charged by private power companies throughout the United States. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Port Arthur for all the electricity he used was only 9 mills a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the United States for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Similar conditions and similar rates prevail throughout the entire Province of Ontario, just as they will throughout this country when the people wake up and demand them.

If the people of Wisconsin got their electricity at the Winnipeg rates, or the Ontario rates, they would save about \$25,000,000 a year.

INDIANA

Now let us turn to the State of Indiana, and take the city of Richmond, where they have a public plant and system owned and operated by the municipality.

Richmond is a city of 33,000 people, and it has a plant valued at \$4,000,000, which it has paid for out of the revenues. In 1938 it generated 42,150,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, which were sold for \$778,313, or at an average of 1.8

cents per kilowatt-hour. The operating expenses were \$293,566, and it made a gross annual profit of \$484,747.

If this overcharge, or gross annual profit, had gone back to the ultimate consumers in Richmond, their electric rates could have been reduced far below the T. V. A. yardstick levels.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is that a steam plant?

Mr. RANKIN. It is a steam plant; yes. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that you can generate power anywhere in the United States with water power, with gas, with oil, or with coal, and sell it at the T. V. A. yardstick rates and yield a reasonable return on legitimate investments.

Yet, as I said, the people of Wisconsin are overcharged \$20,000,000 for their electricity and the people of Indiana, outside of Richmond, are overcharged \$24,000,000 a year.

KANSAS

In Kansas City, Kans., a city of 130,000 people, they have a public plant and system valued at a little more than \$10,000,000. In 1938 they distributed and sold power to the amount of \$2,266,000, at an average of 1.4 cents per kilowatt-hour, just exactly the average sale and distribution rates in the T. V. A. area; while at the same time their operating expenses were \$1,323,000, giving them a gross annual profit of \$943,000, which they could have turned back into the pockets of the consumers, reducing their rates far below the T. V. A. yardstick levels.

Yet the people of the State of Kansas, outside of Kansas City, are overcharged more than \$10,000,000 a year for their electricity.

CALIFORNIA

I find here in the cities of Los Angeles and Pasadena, Calif., the same conditions prevail.

The city of Los Angeles, which has a population of 1,530,000, owns and operates its electric-light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$181,587,984 on which it owes \$107,362,076.

It buys its power from Boulder Dam.

In 1938 it distributed and sold 1,294,611,632 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$25,555,032, or an average of 2 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$11,731,321, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$13,823,711.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Los Angeles was 4.4 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is far below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of California. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Los Angeles for all the electricity he used was only 3.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

The people of California, outside of Los Angeles and Pasadena, are overcharged more than \$32,000,000 a year for their electric lights and power.

Now let us look at Pasadena.

The city of Pasadena, Calif., which has a population of 80,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system. It has a plant and system valued at \$9,912,176, on which it owes \$176,673.

In 1938 it generated and sold 83,084,573 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$1,580,023, or an average of 1.9 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$850,643, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$729,380.

If instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

Yet the maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Pasadena was 4.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of California. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Pasadena for all the electricity he used was only 3.2 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to remark that the city of Pasadena has an amendment in its charter—and I refer to it because it is my home city—which provides for the payment into the general fund of the city of 8 percent of the gross revenues every year, which sum is used for paying the interest and principal on the city's bonded debt.

Mr. RANKIN. In lieu of taxes?

Mr. HINSHAW. Partially in lieu of taxes.

Mr. RANKIN. There was paid into the city treasury in lieu of taxes in 1938 the sum of \$124,551, which carries out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HINSHAW. That has been approved by the State legislature. I should like to remark also to the gentleman that the citizens of Pasadena, through their light bills, have paid for their plant themselves and they did not get a dime from anybody else.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly the point I am making, that if they will break these big holding companies up and sell these properties back to the people in those cities or to the cooperative associations in those areas, they can pay for them out of the revenues and at the same time get their electricity below the T. V. A. rates.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman propose that the people of the Tennessee Valley shall repay the Government for the building of the T. V. A. facilities?

Mr. RANKIN. They are already doing it.

Mr. HINSHAW. To what extent?

Mr. RANKIN. Every dollar of it at the present rate we are paying for wholesale power. We are paying a great deal more for wholesale power than the city of Pasadena is paying for the wholesale power it buys from one of those irrigation projects.

Mr. HINSHAW. We do not buy any power from irrigation projects. We do not even have to buy it from Boulder Dam. We can generate it cheaper than we can buy it.

Mr. RANKIN. We are paying more than Los Angeles is paying for Boulder Dam power, and at the rate we are going at the present time, in 30 years we will pay every dollar that is charged to power and in 50 years we will get back every dollar spent on the T. V. A., including that spent for navigation and flood control.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman be willing to support the bill, that we hope will come before the House a little later, to knock \$25,000,000 off the cost of Boulder Dam, for flood-control purposes, in view of the fact that T. V. A. is very largely flood control?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I have supported it before. I see no reason why the power consumers should be required to pay for flood control, either on the Colorado River or the Tennessee.

What I am driving at is getting electricity to every human being in America at what it is worth, and I shall be pleased to support an amendment of that kind.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I answer the gentleman that every human being in the city of Pasadena and vicinity has electric lights?

Mr. RANKIN. I congratulate this city on the progress it is making.

Mr. HINSHAW. Also, all the farmers in my district have power available, if they want it, right at their front doors.

Mr. RANKIN. That is fine; I know they want it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in anything the gentleman from Mississippi has to say with reference to electric power, because I consider him the authority in this country on this important subject. I should like to know if the gentleman has any data that would show how much Pennsylvania is paying for power, compared with Mississippi, and whether the gentleman would insert that in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I will come to Pennsylvania in just a moment.

FLORIDA

But first I want to refer to the city of Jacksonville, Fla. Jacksonville buys its fuel and hauls it long distances, probably from Oklahoma or Louisiana or Texas, or maybe from California. Jacksonville is a city of 140,000 people. They have a plant valued at \$13,876,890, and it has been paid down to \$4,439,500 out of the revenues. In 1938 they generated and distributed 138,415,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$3,494,608, or an average of 2½ cents a kilowatt hour. But out of that \$3,494,608 they paid operating expenses of \$1,266,527 and made a gross annual profit of \$2,228,081. If they had given that \$2,228,081 back to the consumers of electricity in reduced rates, they could have reduced them far below the T. V. A. yardstick levels. The same thing could be done all over the State. Yet the people of Florida are overcharged more than \$15,000,000 for their electricity.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman realize that it is a fact—which I can prove from my own experience in my own district—that it is cheaper to transmit power by hauling it in a railroad car or a steamboat than it is to transmit it by high-tension lines? We can haul power up from Long Beach in oil a lot cheaper than we can transmit it over the transmission lines.

Mr. RANKIN. No; the gentleman from California is wrong about that.

PENNSYLVANIA

Now, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] that I have here one of the outstanding municipal plants in the State of Pennsylvania—Chambersburg.

The city of Chambersburg, Pa., which has a population of 14,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$509,540 on which it owes nothing. It has been paid for out of the revenues.

In 1938 it generated and sold 10,716,870 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$289,837, or an average of 2.7 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$76,701, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$213,136.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The same thing could be done all over Pennsylvania, yet the people of that State are overcharged more than \$72,000,000 for their electricity.

NEW YORK

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a few more instances, and then I am going to close. I selected this time because I thought that I would not be greatly disturbed. I have not been disappointed.

Let us turn to the State of New York and take the city of Jamestown. The people of the State of New York pay overcharges of from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 a year for electricity. We have seen the Power Trust gobble up the power on the Niagara River, and already we see them opposing the development of power on the St. Lawrence. Why? Because they are not only taking from the people of New York almost \$200,000,000 a year in overcharges but they are holding their rates so high that the people in New York cannot use enough electricity to enjoy it. They are only using around 60 kilowatts a month. We have towns in my district that use an average of 193 kilowatts a month. In New York they only

have a saturation of 48 percent of electric refrigerators, whereas in my home town of Tupelo, Miss., it is 90 percent; and the same thing is true in Corinth.

Jamestown, N. Y., has a population of 48,000 people. What can be done in Jamestown can be done in New York City and in all the other cities in the State of New York. Let us see what Jamestown has accomplished. They have a plant valued at \$4,580,614. It has been in operation for 47 years. They owe only \$70,000 for money that they borrowed at times for extensions. In 1938 they generated 51,085,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity and sold it for \$842,000, or an average of 1.6 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is less than they sold it for in Pasadena. Operating expenses amounted to \$615,000, and they made a gross annual profit of \$227,545. If they had given the consumers in Jamestown the benefit of that reduction, they could have sold electricity much cheaper than we are selling it in the Tennessee Valley area or in Los Angeles, Calif., or in Tacoma, Wash.

Here are some other splendid examples of municipal ownership of electric facilities.

ALABAMA

The city of Florence, Ala., which has a population of 14,427, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$284,489, on which it owes \$188,917.

It buys its power wholesale from the T. V. A. at 4.33 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In 1938 it distributed 10,954,995 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$176,948, or an average of 1.6 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$83,693, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$88,255.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Florence was 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Alabama. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Florence for all the electricity he used was only 1.9 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Remember that 7 years ago the Alabama Power Co. was buying this same power at Muscle Shoals at less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and was selling it to the domestic consumers in Florence at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour and taking all the profits.

If all the electric consumers in Alabama received their lights and power at the Florence rates, they would save more than \$7,000,000 a year. That could be done in every community in that State if the people could own and control their electric facilities.

COLORADO

The city of Colorado Springs, Colo., which has a population of 40,500, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$3,880,065, on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 32,386,760 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$806,572, or an average of 2.5 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$275,617, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$530,955.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rates to the domestic consumers in Colorado Springs were 5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Colorado. And the average paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Colorado Springs for all the electricity he used was only 3.9 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

Remember the people of Colorado are overcharged more than \$8,000,000 a year for their electricity.

GEORGIA

The city of Cordele, Ga., which has a population of 18,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$2,000,000, on which it owes \$1,008,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 22,447,225 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$194,538, or an average of 0.9 cent a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$52,623, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$141,915.

If instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it in to the city treasury it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Cordele was 4.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Georgia. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Cordele for all the electricity he used was only 3.8 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

The people of Georgia are overcharged more than \$11,000,000 a year for their electricity, which could be saved if they owned and controlled their electric facilities.

IDAHO

The city of Bonners Ferry, Idaho, which has a population of 1,500, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$125,000, on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 2,143,200 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$40,150, or an average of 1.9 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$20,130, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$20,020.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Bonners Ferry was 5.85 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Idaho. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Bonners Ferry for all the electricity he used was only 2.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin, or about half the national average.

The people of Idaho could save their overcharges of \$3,500,000 by owning and operating their electric facilities.

IOWA

The city of Atlantic, Iowa, which has a population of 6,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$427,230, on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 4,744,150 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$98,036, or an average of 2.1 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$67,472, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$30,564.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it in to the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Atlantic was 5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies

throughout the State of Iowa. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Atlantic for all the electricity he used was only 4.2 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

The city of Strawberry Point, Iowa, which has a population of 1,127, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$50,000 on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 654,390 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$17,718, or an average of 2.7 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$9,344, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$8,374.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Strawberry Point was 5.4 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Iowa.

The people of Iowa are overcharged more than \$14,000,000 a year for their electricity, which they could save by owning and operating their electric facilities.

MARYLAND

The city of Hagerstown, Md., which has a population of 33,280, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$1,537,541, on which it owes \$325,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 17,472,600 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$455,863, or an average of 2.6 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$161,021, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$294,842.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Hagerstown was 7 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is about the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Maryland. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Hagerstown for all the electricity he used was only 4.2 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Although Maryland is rich in both coal and water power her people are overcharged more than \$13,000,000 a year for their electricity, and yet much of the power used by them is generated at the Conowingo Dam and sold to private power interests for profit at 3.34 mills a kilowatt-hour, which is far below the T. V. A. wholesale rates. But by the time this power gets to the ultimate consumers in Maryland they pay overcharges to the amount of \$13,000,000 a year.

MASSACHUSETTS

The city of Braintree, Mass., which has a population of 19,500, owns and operates its electric-light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$890,264, on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 19,552,200 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$308,403, or an average of 1.6 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$247,589, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$60,814.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below

the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Braintree was 4.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Massachusetts. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Braintree for all the electricity he used was only 2.8 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

The people of Massachusetts are overcharged more than \$44,000,000 a year for their electricity. That is the tribute the helpless consumers of electricity in Massachusetts pay to the Power Trust every year.

MICHIGAN

The city of Lansing, Mich., which has a population of 112,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$12,171,000 on which it owes \$665,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 115,392,818 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$2,240,484, or an average of 1.9 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$867,160, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$1,373,324.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Lansing was 5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Michigan. And, the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Lansing for all the electricity he used was only 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

The power consumers of Michigan are overcharged more than \$40,000,000 for their electric lights and power according to the T. V. A. rates. Michigan adjoins the Province of Ontario and her people should enjoy the same electric rates as do the people of Ontario. If they did, they would save more than \$47,000,000 a year. Ontario's rates are cheaper than those of the T. V. A.

MINNESOTA

The city of Moorhead, Minn., which has a population of 9,170, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$420,623 on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold electricity amounting to \$146,743, or an average of 1.5 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$104,462, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$42,271.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Moorhead was 4.95 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Minnesota. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Moorhead for all the electricity he used was only 3.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

The people of Minnesota pay overcharges for electricity every year amounting to more than \$16,000,000. Minnesota also joins Ontario, and her people should enjoy the Ontario rates; yet, according to the Ontario rates, the people of Minnesota are overcharged more than \$19,000,000 a year.

MISSISSIPPI

Alcorn County (Miss.) Electric Power Association owns and operates its electric light and power system and buys its power wholesale from the T. V. A.

It has a distribution system valued at \$328,000, on which it owes nothing, having paid for it out of the revenues in 5 years.

In 1938 it generated and sold 10,329 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$144,265, or an average of 1.4 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$87,719, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$56,546.

The maximum retail rates to the domestic consumers in Alcorn County were 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is far below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Mississippi. They have now been reduced to 2.5 cents. And the average paid by a domestic consumer in Alcorn County for all the electricity he used was only 1.7 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

This association paid \$11,560 taxes, which is above the average paid by any private power company in Mississippi in a county the size of Alcorn.

The city of Greenwood, Miss., which has a population of 13,500, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$806,182, on which it owes \$120,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 11,660,500 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$255,439, or an average of 2.2 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$95,734, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$159,705.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Greenwood was 7 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is about the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Mississippi. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Greenwood for all the electricity he used was only 3.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Greenwood has recently reduced her rates almost to the T. V. A. rates.

The city of Tupelo, Miss., which has a population of 7,500, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$243,819, on which it owes \$67,916. It buys its power wholesale from the T. V. A.

In 1938 it generated and sold 9,269,100 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$131,091, or an average of 1.4 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$81,073, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$50,018.

It paid \$10,015 taxes and still has \$40,000 net profit left.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Tupelo was 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Mississippi. They have since been reduced to 2.5 cents. And the average paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Tupelo for all the electricity he used was only 1.7 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

Tupelo has now reduced its rates to a maximum of 2½ cents a kilowatt-hour to domestic and commercial consumers.

While the people in northeastern and north central Mississippi enjoy the T. V. A. rates, the people in the rest of the

State are overcharged more than \$4,000,000 for their lights and power—although private power companies buy their power wholesale delivered in Mississippi below the T. V. A. wholesale rates.

MISSOURI

The city of Hannibal, Mo., which has a population of 24,500, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$1,063,463, on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 20,320,100 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$373,110, or an average of 1.8 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$169,872, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$203,238.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Hannibal was 5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Missouri. And the average paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Hannibal for all the electricity he used was only 3.9 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to the domestic consumers.

Hannibal's electric system paid taxes to the amount of \$8,979, gave the city cash donations amounting to \$62,856, and free services to the amount of \$23,251. Yet the people of Missouri are overcharged \$21,000,000 a year for their electricity.

NEBRASKA

The city of Fremont, Nebr., which has a population of 12,300, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$1,353,819, on which it owes nothing.

In 1938 it generated and sold 12,632,500 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$224,060, or an average of 1.8 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$196,246, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$27,814.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Fremont was 4.3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Nebraska. And the average paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Fremont for all the electricity he used was only 2.9 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

The people of Nebraska pay overcharges for their electricity amounting to more than \$7,000,000 a year.

OREGON

The city of Eugene, Oreg., which has a population of 22,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$4,321,964, on which it owes \$554,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 37,100,115 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$551,938, or an average of 1.5 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$272,743, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$279,195.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investment.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Eugene was 6 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Oregon. And the average paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Eugene for all the electricity he used was only 3.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private

power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

The overcharges in Oregon amount to more than \$6,000,000 a year.

TENNESSEE

The city of Knoxville, Tenn., which has a population of 150,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system. It buys its power wholesale from the T. V. A.

It has a plant and system valued at \$6,575,000, which it purchased in 1938.

In the 4 months it operated this system in 1938 it sold 13,753,669 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$160,444, or an average of 1.2 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$100,494, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$59,950.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Knoxville was 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is far below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Tennessee. And the average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Knoxville for all the electricity he used was only 2.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

TEXAS

The city of Austin, Tex., which has a population of 78,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$5,500,000 on which it owes nothing, having paid for it out of the revenues.

In 1938 it generated and sold 64,656,600 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$1,346,826, or an average of 2.1 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$427,542, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$919,284.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Austin was 6 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Texas. The average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Austin for all the electricity he used was 5.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

The people of Texas are overcharged more than \$31,000,000 a year for electricity—in a State where there is enough natural gas going to waste to generate electricity enough to supply four or five States the size of Texas. It could be supplied to the people of Texas at less than the T. V. A. rates.

For instance, the Louisiana Power & Light Co. generates power, transmits it into Arkansas, and sells it wholesale to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. at 2.6 mills a kilowatt-hour, which is about half the T. V. A. wholesale rate. But by the time it gets to the people of Arkansas they pay overcharges that for the whole State amount to \$5,600,000 a year; and the people of Louisiana are overcharged \$9,000,000 a year.

VERMONT

Now, let us take a small town in far-away Vermont—one that has to get all its fuel from another State.

The town of Morrisville, Vt., which has a population of only 1,875, owns and operates its electric-light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$595,049, on which it owes \$68,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 5,840,097 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$73,631, or an average of 1.3 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is below the T. V. A. average rate.

The total operating expenses were \$50,770, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$22,861.

Yet the maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Morrisville was 6 cents a kilowatt-hour which is below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Vermont. The average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Morrisville for all the electricity he used was only 2.8 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers.

VIRGINIA

The city of Danville, Va., which has a population of 30,000 owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$5,337,781 which it has paid down to \$2,086,000 out of its revenues.

In 1938 it generated and sold 20,464,130 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$654,600, or an average of 3.2 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were only \$206,873, which taken from the total revenues left a gross annual profit of \$447,727, or more than two-thirds of the total revenues.

If, instead of collecting this overcharge and turning it into the city treasury, it had given it back to the consumers in rate reductions, these rates would have been reduced far below the T. V. A. yardstick rates, and the city would have made ample returns on its investments, and the consumers would have doubled their consumption and further increased the revenues and the profits.

Yet the maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Danville was 6 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is about the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Virginia, and is less than two-thirds the rates charged by private power companies 7 years ago, before the T. V. A. was created, and its yardstick rates published to the world. Thus it will be seen that the T. V. A. has helped to bring relief to the electric light and power consumers in every section of the country.

The people of Virginia are still overcharged \$11,000,000 a year for their electric lights and power.

WASHINGTON

The city of Tacoma, Wash., which has a population of 112,000, owns and operates its electric light and power system.

It has a plant and system valued at \$24,429,242, on which it owes \$4,563,000.

In 1938 it generated and sold 348,119,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for \$2,473,735, or an average of 7 mills a kilowatt-hour.

The total operating expenses were \$706,401, which, taken from the total revenues, left a gross annual profit of \$1,767,334.

The maximum retail rate to the domestic consumers in Tacoma was 4.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, which is far, far below the average maximum rates charged by private power companies throughout the State of Washington. The average rate paid by a domestic consumer in the city of Tacoma for all the electricity he used was only 1.6 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 4.06 cents a kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies throughout the country for all electricity sold to domestic consumers, as shown by the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin.

If we could get power to all the American people at the Tacoma rates, they would save \$1,130,000,000 a year.

CONCLUSION

I could fill the RECORD with illustrations of this kind, but I feel that these are sufficient to prove to any unbiased mind that electricity can be generated and distributed to the ultimate consumers anywhere in the United States at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, which would save the people of this country a billion dollars a year on their light and power bills alone. [Applause.]

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 643. An act authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinalt Reservation, State of Washington; and

S. 1935. An act to extend until March 4, 1944, the time during which petitions may be filed by farmers under section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6505. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. R. 7270. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.), in accordance to the order heretofore entered the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and naturalization Wednesday, March 6, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2176, H. R. 7878, and H. R. 8236.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Monday, March 4, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be continued before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary public hearings on the following bills:

H. R. 3331 and S. 1032, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States," and for other purposes.

H. R. 6395, to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, to certain contracts carried out with the aid of Federal funds.

The hearings will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

On Monday, March 4, 1940, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on the bill, H. R. 7737, to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States and direct appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States in certain cases involving the constitutional validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes.

The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Thursday, March 7, 1940:

H. R. 6321, to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

This bill was previously referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, but under date of February 26 it was rereferred to this committee.

Tuesday, March 12, 1940:

H. R. 5476, to create the Alaska Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes.

H. R. 6690, making further provision for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7542, to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1924.

H. R. 7987, to amend section 1 of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relative to the fisheries of Alaska.

H. R. 7988, making provision for employment of the residents of Alaska in the fisheries of said Territory, and for other purposes.

H. R. 8115, making provision for employment of residents of Alaska only in the salmon fishery of the Bristol Bay area, Alaska, during the year 1940.

H. R. 8172, to amend section 5 of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1906, relative to the Alaska salmon fishery. Tuesday, March 19, 1940:

H. R. 6136, to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1353; 34 U. S. C. 1122), so as to authorize an appropriation of \$50,000 annually to aid in the maintenance and support of marine schools.

H. R. 7094, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California, for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7870, to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, to include Astoria, Oreg.

H. R. 8612, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California, for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents, House of Representatives, will hold hearings Thursday, March 14, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 8445, to protect the United States in patent-infringement suits. H. R. 8445 is a substitute for H. R. 6877.

The Committee on Patents will hold hearings Thursday, March 21, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on S. 2689, to amend section 33 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, relating to unlawful importation of copyrighted works.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1420. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report of unofficial knowledge of the bringing of a contest growing out of the special election held September 13, 1939, to fill the vacancy in the Seventy-sixth Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of Tennessee (H. Doc. No. 645); to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and ordered to be printed.

1421. A letter from the Chairman, Maritime Labor Board, transmitting the report of the Maritime Labor Board (H. Doc. No. 646); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

1422. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the Nineteenth Annual Report and a statement showing the names, titles, and compensation of the members and employees of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1423. A letter from the secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Annual Report of the American Chemical Society for the Calendar Year 1939; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House resolution 355. Resolution to amend House resolution 199, Seventy-sixth Congress, providing compensation for a superintendent and messenger for the radio room of the House radio press gallery (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7084. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia," approved August 25, 1937; without amendment (Rept.

No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7114. A bill to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931; with amendment (Rept. No. 1704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8694. A bill to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 466. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 465. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7562. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo Kaufmann and his wife, Ellinor T. Kaufmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 391. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to submit all information concerning American merchant ships and airplanes, by name, that have been stopped by belligerents since September 1, 1939 (Rept. No. 1708). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 8729. A bill to provide for exercising the right with respect to red cedar shingles reserved in the trade agreement concluded November 17, 1938, between the United States of America and Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 8730. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provisions for the control and prevention of industrial conditions hazardous to the health of employees; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 8731. A bill to establish a permanent Industrial Loan Corporation to assist financing institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DEROUEN:

H. R. 8732 (by request). A bill to promote the development of the Territory of Alaska and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8733. A bill to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8734. A bill to repeal the District of Columbia Income Tax Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and starving men, women, and children of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 478. Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and starving men, women, and children of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "The Neutrality Act of 1939," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THILL:

H. Res. 410. Resolution to investigate war propaganda in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, with reference to Senate bill 2212, relative to the development of marketing and marketing services for farm commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8735. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Agnes Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 8736. A bill for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 8737. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Nichols; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 8738. A bill for the relief of August Runge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. R. 8739. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Kee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8740. A bill for the relief of the heirs of William H. Peters and Washington Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 8741. A bill for the relief of William A. Lowe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 8742. A bill for the relief of Eugene Bowman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8743. A bill for the relief of Luther Haden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 8744. A bill for the relief of Ernest Lyle Greenwood and Phyllis Joy Greenwood; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6740. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by State Council No. 16 of the Polish Women's Alliance of America, of Niagara Falls, urging passage of the bill for the relief of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6741. By Mr. BALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Willimantic, Conn., protesting against the levying of an excise or any other form of processing tax on bread; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6742. By Mr. COLLINS: Concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of Mississippi, memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the program of the

Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6743. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of A. T. Davis, of Hot Springs, and 73 other residents of the West River district of South Dakota, urging passage of the Patman chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6744. Also, petition of C. R. Holtry, of Vale, and 57 other residents of the West River district of South Dakota, urging enactment of the Patman chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6745. Also, petition of M. Estrup and 50 other residents of Rapid City, S. Dak., urging approval and enactment of the Patman chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6746. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Highway Commission, urging authorization for an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 for the elimination of hazards to life at railroad highway grade crossings; to the Committee on Roads.

6747. Also, petition of William Williamson, of Owanka, S. Dak., and 56 other residents of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, urging enactment of the Patman chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6748. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Petition of the Citizens Committee of Buffalo and vicinity, Buffalo, N. Y., beseeching the Government of the United States to aid the stricken people of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6749. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Mrs. Marian L. Juddson, representative for the committee for conservation of natural resources for Bay Ridge High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Barkley bill (S. 685); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6750. Also, petition of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, Inc., New York City, concerning repeal of the Tydings-Miller Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6751. Also, petition of Lee & Simmons, Inc., New York City, opposing any legislation that will be detrimental to the sugar-refinery workers of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6752. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Marion L. Juddson, representative for the committee for conservation of natural resources for Bay Ridge High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging defeat of the Barkley bill and consideration of the Mundt bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6753. Also, petition of Lee & Simmons, Inc., New York City, opposing any change in the Sugar Act of 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6754. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against the sale of war materials to the Japanese Empire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6755. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of members of Local G-2076, of the Workers Alliance of America, Susquehanna County, Pa., favoring a revision of the 1940 Relief Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6756. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the National Automobile Dealers Association, favoring revision of Wagner National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6757. By Mr. SPRINGER: Resolution of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, in convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., January 20, 1940, urging that the Congress of the United States take no steps to repeal the so-called Tydings-Miller law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6758. Also, resolution adopted by the executive committee, National Automobile Dealers Association, in session at the Hotel Netherland-Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 23-24, 1940, urging certain amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6759. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the United Polish Societies, of Jamaica, N. Y., urging the appropriation of financial aid to help ameliorate the sufferings and privations of the distressed people of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6760. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of the State of Mississippi, requesting an appropriation of \$250,000 for a General Samuel Dale National Shrine; to the Committee on the Library.

6761. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, urging the establishment of a Regular Army or military post in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6762. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 4905, 4907, 4909, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3033, 3392, 130, and 163, antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6763. Also, petition of the Perth Amboy Republican Club, Perth Amboy, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the election of Presidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6764. Also, petition of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, Inc., New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the so-called Tydings-Miller law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1940

The Chaplain, Rev. ZēBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, whose love for us is so constant that it passeth understanding, whose justice is wider than our mercy and whose purpose is greater than our prayer: We commit ourselves and our Nation to Thy holy keeping, for Thou knowest our frame, Thou rememberest that we are but dust; help us therefore to trust only in that forgiveness which needs not to forget.

We pray especially today that Thy choicest blessings may rest upon our President, who once again before Thy sanctuary has renewed his pledge of fealty and devotion to his country and his God. May he cast upon Thee all his cares and the overheavy burdens of his high and holy office, and may he set before his eyes Thy watchful eye and Thine uncorrupted judgment, that the people of America may find Thy way to be the way of holiness which leads to everlasting peace for all mankind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 29, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calhoun, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 424) to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to acquire certain lands at St. Petersburg, Fla.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 635) to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7809. An act authorizing the reconstruction or replacement of certain bridges necessitated by the Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose; and

H. R. 8668. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 643. An act authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinalt Reservation, State of Washington; and

S. 1935. An act to extend until March 4, 1944, the time during which petitions may be filed by farmers under section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 29th ultimo,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature on February 29, 1940, after adjournment of the Senate, to the enrolled bill (S. 3069) to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commission of Fine Arts of their activities during the period January 1, 1935, to December 31, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1940.

[NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

DISBURSEMENTS OF FUNDS UNDER "STATE ACCOUNT OF ADVANCES"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to permit the Secretary of State to authorize disbursements of appropriated funds under a "State account of advances."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1940.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

TELEPHONES IN OFFICIAL RESIDENCES, FOREIGN SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

There are transmitted herewith a report of the Secretary of State and a draft of a proposed amendment to existing legislation designed primarily to provide for the installation and maintenance of telephones in the official residences of American Ambassadors, Ministers, and officers of the Foreign Service, which the Government is acquiring by purchase or lease, or constructing in various foreign countries under the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of May 7, 1926.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1940.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Draft of a proposed amendment to the act of August 23, 1912, 37 Stat. 414.]

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 151)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting a proposed provision of legislation relating to a judgment